10 AA*

AN
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANTIENT AND MODERN,

FROM

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,

TO THE

BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

IN WHICH

The Riſe, Progreſs, and Variations of CHURCH POWER

ARE CONSIDERED

In their Connexion with the State of LEARNING and PHILOSOPHY,
and the POLITICAL HISTORY of EUROPE during that Period.

By the late learned

JOHN LAWRENCE MOSHEIM, D. D.

And Chancellor of the Univerſity of GOTTINGEN.

16

Tranſlated from the ORIGINAL,
And accompanied with NOTES and CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES,
By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, M. A.
Miniſter of the ENGLISH CHURCH at the HAGUE.

To the whole is added AN ACCURATE INDEX.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON,
Printed for A. MILLAR, in *The Strand.* MDCCLXV.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

TO

HIS MOST SERENE HIGHNESS,

WILLIAM V,

PRINCE OF ORANGE AND NASSAU,

HEREDITARY STADTHOLDER,

CAPTAIN GENERAL AND ADMIRAL

OF THE UNITED PROVINCES &c.

SIR,

I CANNOT but eſteem it the higheſt honour to be permitted to give your SERENE HIGHNESS a public teſtimony of my homage and reſpect by laying the following work at your feet. Teſtimonies, indeed, of this kind, when offered to Princes, are generally attended with ſuch high ſtrains of panegyric, as have contributed to render the credibility of *Dedications* more than dubious. The abuſe of a cuſtom, originally deſigned to pay a juſt tribute of applauſe to the great and good, to the patrons of religion, virtue, liberty, and letters, has been ſo common; and the proſtitution of it ſo notorious, that, if the language of *Dedications* were alone to be conſulted, it would be difficult to diſtinguiſh a *Nero* from a *Trajan*, a *Philip the Second* from a PRINCE OF ORANGE.

IT is certain, SIR, that we live in an age in which the merit of Princes is not appreciated by the reports of an oracle, whoſe deciſions are ſo often found to be falſe and deluſive; but by the luſtre of their domeſtic virtues, the wiſdom of their public meaſures, and the general tenor of their conduct and actions: and I know, MOST SERENE PRINCE, that, in the high ſphere of action to which Providence is leading you with ſuch diſtinguiſhed marks of protection and favour, you deſire to be judged by no other *Criterion*. I know, that both precept and example have pointed out to you the path to true glory; that your virtuous heart has reliſhed their leſſons; and that the love of fame, which even Heroes have acknowledged as the ſole ſpring of their conduct, will be, with you, but a ſubordinate motive to reduce theſe leſſons to practice.

WERE I capable of drawing with the ſtricteſt truth the Portrait of your SERENE HIGHNESS, I ſhould ſcarcely think it expedient to place it here, for the reaſons already mentioned. Beſides: thoſe (if any ſuch there be) who are yet unacquainted with the *joyful* and *general* hopes this Republic entertains in the proſpect of your approaching Government, would look upon the truth as exaggeration, and, not knowing the obſcure perſon that pronounced it, perhaps as flattery; while thoſe judges of true merit, who have the honour to approach your SERENE HIGHNESS, would certainly find the Portrait defective.

BUT while I with-hold, MOST SERENE PRINCE, that tribute of praiſe that is due to your early merit, and which, I am perſuaded, your virtuous ambition deſires rather to deſerve ſtill farther than to receive at preſent, there are certain effuſions of the heart, which neither my character, as a Chriſtian miniſter, nor as a citizen of this Republic, will permit me to ſuppreſs on this occaſion. I cannot conceal thoſe feelings, which ſo naturally ariſe from a view of the goodneſs of the Divine Providence to this Nation in the maintenance of your Illuſtrious Houſe, the preſervation of your precious days, and the education your SERENE HIGHNESS has received under the tender and wiſe inſpection of that great and good Prince, who bears with ſuch dignity the glorious name of BRUNSWICK. It is with inexpreſſible joy, that we ſee this reſpectable guide pointing out to you the Heroes, that you are more peculiarly called to imitate, in that glorious line of anceſtors, who have gone before you to immortality, and performing with a truly parental affection that important taſk, that was for ſo ſhort a ſpace intruſted with thoſe illuſtrious Parents of whom you were deprived in the very dawn of life. But it is with ſingular feelings of ſatisfaction and delight, that we behold in your SERENE HIGHNESS the fruits of an excellent education growing to a happy maturity and promiſing a new period of proſperity and glory to a Republic, ſounded by a PRINCE OF ORANGE, whoſe venerable name and heroic deeds will ſhine in the annals of public liberty and public virtue as long as the ſacred names of liberty and virtue ſhall be known among men.

THE work I here humbly preſent to your SERENE HIGHNESS, is the *Hiſtory of the Chriſtian Religion*; that Divine Religion, which you, SIR, have ſtudied with uncommon application, judgment, and ſucceſs. It is upon good grounds that I make this declaration, as I, myſelf, had the honour of being a witneſs to your remarkable progreſs in religious knowledge on that memorable day, when, before an illuſtrious aſſembly of the States of this Nation, you gave publicly *a reaſon of the faith that is in you*, and excited the admiration of thoſe that were preſent on this ſolemn occaſion. It is not, therefore, without a certain degree of propriety, that I addreſs to your SERENE HIGHNESS the Tranſlation of an important work, which has the Hiſtory of Religion for its object. It is true, the language of the original is perfectly familiar to your SERENE HIGHNESS; I would, nevertheleſs, hope that the Tranſlation may not be entirely unworthy of your attention, if my zealous endeavours to render it ſtill more intereſting than the original have not been utterly unſucceſsful.

IF your SERENE HIGHNESS deigns to peruſe the following work, which is certainly compoſed with more judgment and freedom than any Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory that has hitherto appeared,

peared, you will find in it a great variety of objects, all inſtructive, though not, indeed, equally pleaſing. You will ſee, on the one hand, the Religion of JESUS riſing upon a benighted world, ſtriking conviction into the hearts of mortals by the irreſiſtible luſtre of its divine truths, conquering the paſſions and prejudices of men, confounding the oppoſition of Nations and Empires, furniſhing new ſupports to civil and ſocial virtue, and unfolding thoſe ſublime doctrines and maxims that tend to the perfection of human nature and the happineſs of human ſociety. But you will alſo obſerve, on the other hand, the lamentable changes that have been introduced into the church in conſequence of the corruption of men, the ambition of a licentious and deſpotic prieſthood, and the bigotry and tyranny of ignorant and wicked ſovereigns. Your SERENE HIGHNESS will alſo ſee in the following work, the happy events that have ariſen, at certain periods, from the efforts of a wiſe, pious, learned, and moderate clergy, ſeconded by the influence and authority of religious Princes, whoſe counſels and examples have always a commanding power, that enables them to do good with a facility peculiar to them alone. This part of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, I am perſuaded, SIR, you will read with pleaſure, and not without a noble ſpirit of emulation. But your SERENE HIGHNESS will obſerve, with a generous concern, that theſe efforts have not been ſufficient to extinguiſh that unhappy ſpirit of Fanaticiſm, of whoſe deplorable effects the learned author has exhibited ſuch a ſtriking picture; and you will find, in all ages of the church, enthuſiaſtical ſects ſtriking out new forms of religion, by working on the paſſions of the ignorant and unwary, and deriving their rules of faith and manners from the fallacious ſuggeſtions of a warm imagination, rather than from the clear and infallible dictates of the word of God. Your SERENE HIGHNESS will ſee, in the courſe of this Hiſtory, various abuſes, which the true and judicious friends of Chriſtianity will ſeriouſly lay to heart. You will ſee one ſett of men covering religion with a tawdry habit of type and allegory; another converting it into an inſtrument of diſſenſion and diſcord: and your diſcerning mind will eaſily obſerve the unhappy conſequences of departing from the divine ſimplicity of the Goſpel, and loading its pure and heavenly doctrines with the inventions and *commandments of men.* Finally, SIR, you will ſee, in the following work, the tendency of *true religion* to ſtrengthen the ſprings of government by purifying the motives and animating the zeal of thoſe that govern, to promote thoſe virtues that exalt a nation, by rendering its inhabitants good ſubjects and true patriots, and by confirming all the reſpectable bonds and obligations of civil ſociety. Here more particularly, your SERENE HIGHNESS will be fixed in the belief of one important truth, which no wiſe and good Prince will ever loſe ſight of, that *the enemies of religion are the enemies of mankind*; and that it is the *natural tendency* of *infidelity* and licentiouſneſs to *diſſolve* the moſt ſacred obligations, to *remove* the moſt powerful motives to virtue, and, by *corrupting the principles of individuals, to poiſon the ſources of public order and public proſperity.*

As you are called, SIR, by the voice of Divine Providence to watch over the proſperity of theſe United Provinces, to be the guardian of their privileges and the ornament and defender of their pure and holy Religion, theſe conſiderations muſt naturally make a deep impreſſion on your mind. They will certainly influence the meaſures your SERENE HIGHNESS will, one day, employ for promoting the happineſs of the ſtate, encreaſing the purity and luſtre of the church, and advancing the intereſts of the Redeemer's kingdom, which is a kingdom of *righteouſneſs*, *charity*, and *truth*.

MAY the God, by whom Kings reign and Princes decree juſtice, ſtrengthen your hands for performing with dignity this important taſk! May he prolong your days and render them ever precious to the people of this land! May you be the illuſtrious inſtrument of his wiſdom and power, for reſtraining the growth of impiety, and covering licentiouſneſs and vice with that infamy and confuſion which are their juſt and natural reward! May religion and virtue flouriſh under your influence, and derive a commanding authority from your pious example! May public ſpirit, with the arts and ſciences, acquire new vigour under your auſpicious protection! And, when after a long courſe of days, crowned with public proſperity and domeſtic happineſs, you ſhall be called from the tranſitory ſcene of human grandeur, to *a kingdom which ſhall never be moved*, may our children's children ſay to their poſterity, with tears of grateful ſorrow in their eyes, *When the ear heard him, then it bleſſed him; when the eye ſaw him, it gave witneſs to him—becauſe he put on righteouſneſs and it cloathed him, and becauſe judgment and equity were his robe and diadem!*

THESE, ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCE, are the devout wiſhes of an affectionate people; and they ſhall never ceaſe to be the ardent prayer of,

SIR,

YOUR SERENE HIGHNESS'S

moſt dutiful,

moſt obedient,

and moſt devoted Servant,

ARCHIBALD MACLAINE.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

I CANNOT perſuade myſelf, that the complaints we hear frequently of the frivolous nature of the public taſte in matters of literature, are ſo far to be relied on, as to make me deſpair of a favorable reception of the following work. A Hiſtory of the Chriſtian Church, compoſed with judgment, taſte, and candour, drawn, with uncommon diſcernment and induſtry, from the beſt ſources, enriched with much uſeful learning and ſeveral important diſcoveries, and connected with the Hiſtory of Arts, Philoſophy, and Civil Government, is an object that will very probably attract the attention of many, and muſt undoubtedly excite the curioſity of the judicious and the wiſe. A work of this nature will be conſidered by the *Philoſopher* as an important branch of the Hiſtory of the Human Mind, and I need not mention a multitude of reaſons that render it peculiarly intereſting to the *Chriſtian*. Beſides; there has not hitherto appeared, in Engliſh, any compleat Hiſtory of the Church, that repreſents its revolutions, its diviſions, and doctrines, with impartiality and truth, expoſes the deluſions of popiſh legends, breathes a ſpirit of moderation and freedom, and, keeping perpetually in the view of the reader the true nature and deſign of the Chriſtian religion, points out the deviations from its beautiful ſimplicity, that have been too frequent among all orders of men and in all ages of the world.

The following work has the beſt claim, of any I know, to theſe characters [a]; and its peculiar merit is pointed out, as far as modeſty

---

[a] Some time after I had undertaken this tranſlation, I was honoured with a letter from the learned Biſhop of *Glouceſter*, in which he was ſo good as to teſtify his approbation of my deſign, and to ſpeak of the work I here offer to the public in an Engliſh dreſs, in the following manner: MOSHEIM's *Compendium is excellent, the method admirable; in ſhort, the only one deſerving the name*

modeſty would permit, in the enſuing Preface of its juſtly celebrated author. The reputation of this great man is very well known. His noble birth ſeemed to open to his ambition a fair path to civil promotion; but his zeal for the intereſts of religion, his inſatiable thirſt after knowledge, and more eſpecially his predominant taſte for ſacred literature, induced him to conſecrate his admirable talents to the ſervice of the church. The German univerſities loaded him with literary honours. The king of *Denmark* invited him to ſettle at *Copenhagen*. The duke of *Brunſwick* called him from thence to *Helmſtadt*, where he received the marks of diſtinction due to his eminent abilities; filled, with applauſe, the academical chair of divinity; was honoured with the character of eccleſiaſtical counſellor to that reſpectable court; and preſided over the ſeminaries of learning in the dutchy of *Wolfembuttle* and the principality of *Blakenburg*. When the late king formed the deſign of giving an uncommon degree of luſtre to the Univerſity of *Gottingen*, by filling it with men of the firſt rank in the literary world, ſuch as a HALLER, a GRESNER, and a MICHAELIS, Dr. MOSHEIM was deemed worthy to appear at the head of that famous ſeat of learning in the quality of chancellor, and here he died, univerſally lamented, in the year 1755, and in the ſixty-firſt year of his age. In depth of judgment, in extent of learning, in the powers of a noble and maſculine eloquence, in purity of taſte, and in a laborious application to all the various branches of erudition and philoſophy, he had certainly very few ſuperiors. His Latin tranſlation of the celebrated Dr. CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe*, enriched with large annotations, diſcovered ſuch a profound acquaintance with ancient philoſophy and erudition, as juſtly excited the admiration of the learned world. His ingenious illuſtrations of the ſacred writings, his ſucceſsful labours in the defence of Chriſtianity, and the light he caſt upon the hiſtory of religion and philoſophy by his uninterrupted reſearches, appear in a multitude of volumes, which are deſervedly placed among the moſt valuable

---

of an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. It deſerves, and needs, frequent notes — I hope this eminent prelate will not take amiſs my placing here a teſtimony that was not deſigned to be produced in this public manner. It is, however, ſo adapted to give thoſe who examine recommendations with diſcernment a favorable notion of the following work, that I could not think of ſuppreſſing it. It is uſual, in publiſhing certain ancient authors, to prefix to them the encomiums they have been honoured with by thoſe whoſe authority is reſpected in the republic of letters. I adopt this cuſtom ſo far as to mention one teſtimony; — more would be unneceſſary; the teſtimony of a WARBURTON is abundantly ſufficient to anſwer my purpoſe, and will be juſtly looked upon as equivalent to a multitude.

treaſures of ſacred and profane literature, and the learned and judicious work, that is here preſented to the public, will undoubtedly render his name illuſtrious in the records of religion and letters.

How far juſtice has been done to this excellent work, in the following tranſlation, is a point that muſt be left to the deciſion of thoſe who ſhall think proper to peruſe it with attention. I can ſay, with the ſtricteſt truth, that I have ſpared no pains to render it worthy of their gracious acceptance; and this conſideration gives me ſome claim to their candour and indulgence, for any defects they may find in it. I have endeavoured to render my tranſlation faithful, but never propoſed to render it entirely literal. The ſtyle of the original is, by no means, a model to imitate in a work deſigned for general uſe. Dr. MOSHEIM affected brevity, and laboured to crowd many things into few words; thus his diction, though pure and correct, became ſententious and harſh, without that harmony which pleaſes the ear and thoſe tranſitions which make a narration flow with eaſe. This being the caſe, I have ſometimes taken conſiderable liberties with my author, and followed the *ſpirit* of his narrative without adhering ſtrictly to the *letter*. Where, indeed, the Latin phraſe appeared to me elegant, expreſſive, and compatible with the Engliſh idiom, I have conſtantly followed it; in all other caſes, I have departed from it, and have often added a few ſentences to render an obſervation more ſtriking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finiſhed. Had I been tranſlating CICERO or TACITUS, I ſhould not have thought ſuch freedom pardonable. The tranſlation of a claſſic author, like the copy of a capital picture, muſt exhibit not only the *ſubject*, but alſo the *manner* of the original; this rule, however, is not applicable to the work now under conſideration.

The reader will eaſily diſtinguiſh the *additional* Notes of the Tranſlator from the *original* ones of the Author; the references to the latter being included in *crotchets only*, as thus [*a*], [*b*]; thoſe to the former in *parentheſes* likewiſe, thus, [(*a*), [(*b*), with a *crotchet* at the beginning, as well as the end, of each reſpective note [(*a*) ....]

My diſtance from the preſs has prevented my correcting ſome errors committed by the printer, which are not, however, either numerous or important. One of the principal is the *running title*, viz. *The State of* LEARNING *and* PHILOSOPHY, which is continued on the right-hand page without interruption from the beginning of the firſt volume to p. 549. The impropriety of this will be eaſily obſerved by the reader, as the *State of Learning* is the ſubject of only *one* of the *Five Chapters*, that comprehend the *Internal Hiſtory* of each century.

When I entered upon this undertaking, I propoſed rendering the additional notes more numerous and ample, than the reader will find them. I ſoon perceived that the proſecution of my original plan would render this work too voluminous, and this induced me to alter my purpoſe. The notes I have given are not, however, inconſiderable in number; I wiſh I could ſay as much with reſpect to their merit and importance.—I would only hope, that ſome of them will be looked upon, as not altogether unneceſſary.

Hague, Dec. 4.
1764.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE different editions of the *Elements of the Chriſtian Hiſtory* [a] met with ſuch a favorable reception from the public, and the demand for them was ſo great, that they were, in a little time, out of print. Upon this occaſion, the worthy perſon, at whoſe expence they had been preſented to the public, deſired earneſtly to give a new edition of the ſame work improved and enlarged, and thus ſtill more worthy of its gracious acceptance. The other occupations in which I was engaged, and a prudent conſideration of the labour I muſt undergo in the correction and augmentation of a work in which I myſelf perceived ſo many imperfections, prevented my yielding, for a long time, to his earneſt ſollicitations. The importunities of my friends at length prevailed upon me to undertake this difficult work; and I have employed aſſiduouſly my hours of leiſure, during the ſpace of two years, in bringing it to as high a degree of perfection as I am capable of giving it. So that now theſe Elements of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory appear under a new form, and the changes they have undergone are certainly advantageous in every reſpect. I have retained ſtill the diviſion of the whole into certain periods; for though a continued narration would have been more agreeable to my own taſte, and had alſo ſeveral circumſtances to recommend it, yet the counſels of ſome learned men, who have experienced the great advantages of that diviſion, engaged me to prefer it to every other method. And indeed, when we examine this matter with due attention, we ſhall find, that the author, who propoſes comprehending in one work all that variety of obſervations and facts that are neceſſary to an acquaintance with the ſtate of Chriſtianity in the different ages of the church, will find it impoſſible to execute this deſign without adopting certain diviſions of time, and others relating to the diverſity of the objects that demand a place in his Hiſtory. And as this was my deſign in the following work, I have left its primitive

---

[(a) A ſmall work publiſhed by Dr. MOSHEIM, many years ago, in two volumes, 12mo.

form entire, and made it my principal buſineſs to correct, improve and augment it in ſuch a manner, as to render it more inſtructive and entertaining to the reader.

My principal care has been employed in eſtabliſhing upon the moſt ſolid foundations, and confirming by the moſt reſpectable authority, the credit of the facts related in this Hiſtory. For this purpoſe, I have drawn from the fountain-head, and have gone to thoſe genuine ſources from whence the pure and uncorrupted ſtreams of evidence flow. I have conſulted the beſt authors of every age, and chiefly thoſe who were contemporary with the events they relate, or lived near the periods in which they happened; and I have endeavoured to report their contents with brevity, perſpicuity, and preciſion. Abbreviators do, generally ſpeaking, little more than reduce to a ſhort and narrow compaſs thoſe large bodies of hiſtory, that have been compiled from original authors; this method may be, in ſome meaſure, juſtified by ſeveral reaſons, and therefore is not to be entirely diſapproved. From hence nevertheleſs it happens, that the errors, which almoſt always abound in large and voluminous productions, are propagated with facility, and, paſſing from one book into many, are unhappily handed down from age to age. This I had formerly obſerved in ſeveral abridgments; and I had lately the mortification to find ſome inſtance of this in my own work, when I examined it by the pure lamp of antiquity, and compared it with thoſe original records that are conſidered as the genuine ſources of ſacred hiſtory. It was then, that I perceived the danger of confiding implicitly even in thoſe who are the moſt generally eſteemed on account of their fidelity, penetration, and diligence; and it was then alſo, that I became ſenſible of the neceſſity of adding, ſuppreſſing, changing, and correcting ſeveral things in the ſmall work which I formerly publiſhed, and which has been already mentioned. In the execution of this neceſſary taſk, I can affirm with truth, that I have not been wanting in perſeverance, induſtry, or attention; and yet with all theſe it is extremely difficult to avoid miſtakes of every kind, as thoſe who are acquainted with the nature of hiſtorical reſearches abundantly know. How far I have approached to that inacceſſible degree of exactneſs, which is chargeable with no error, muſt be left to the deciſion of thoſe whoſe extenſive knowledge of the Chriſtian hiſtory entitles them to pronounce judgment in this matter. That ſuch may judge with the more facility, I have mentioned the authors who have been my guides; and, if I have in any reſpect miſrepreſented their accounts or their ſentiments, I muſt confeſs that I am much more inexcuſable than ſome other hiſtorians, who have met with and deſerved the ſame reproach, ſince I have peruſed with attention and compared with each other the various authors to whoſe teſtimony I appeal, having formed a reſolution of truſting to no authority inferior to that of the original ſources of hiſtorical truth.

In order to execute, with ſome degree of ſucceſs, the deſign I formed of rendering my abridgment more perfect, and of giving the hiſtory of the church as it ſtands in the moſt authentic records and in the writings of thoſe whoſe authority is moſt reſpectable, I found myſelf obliged to make many changes and additions. Theſe will be viſible through the whole of the following work, but more eſpecially in the THIRD BOOK, which comprehends the hiſtory of the Chriſtian, and particularly of the Latin or Weſtern church, from CHARLEMAGNE to the riſe of LUTHER and the commencement of the Reformation. This period of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, though it abound with ſhining examples; though it be unſpeakably uſeful as a key to the knowledge of the political, as well as religious, ſtate of *Europe*; though it be ſingularly adapted to unfold the origin and explain the reaſons of many modern tranſactions, has nevertheleſs been hitherto treated with leſs perſpicuity, ſolidity, and elegance, than any other branch of the hiſtory of the church. The number of writers that have attempted to throw light upon this intereſting period is conſiderable, but few of them are in the hands of the public. The barbarous ſtyle of one part of them, the profound ignorance of another, and the partial and factious ſpirit of a third, are ſuch as render them by no means inviting; and the enormous bulk and exceſſive price of the productions of ſome of the beſt of theſe writers muſt neceſſarily render them ſcarce. It is further to be obſerved, that ſome of the moſt valuable records that belong to the period of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory now under conſideration, lie yet in manuſcript in the collections of the curious (or the opulent, who are willing to paſs for ſuch) and are thus concealed from public view. Thoſe who conſider theſe circumſtances will no longer be ſurprized, that, in this part of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the moſt learned and laborious writers have omitted many things of conſequence, and treated others without ſucceſs. Among theſe, the annaliſts and other hiſtorians, ſo highly celebrated by the church of *Rome*, ſuch as BARONIUS, RAYNALDUS, BZOVIUS, MANRIQUEZ, and WADDING, though they were amply furniſhed with ancient manuſcripts and records, have nevertheleſs committed more faults, and fallen into errors of greater conſequence, than other writers, who were by far their inferiors in learning and credit, and had much leſs acceſs to original records than they were favoured with.

Theſe conſiderations induce me to hope, that the work I here preſent to the public will neither appear ſuperfluous nor uſeleſs. For as I have employed many years in the moſt laborious reſearches, in order to acquire a thorough acquaintance with the hiſtory of Chriſtianity from the eighth century downwards, and as I flatter myſelf that, by the aſſiſtance of books and manuſcripts too little conſulted, I have arrived at a more certain and ſatisfactory knowledge of that period than is to be found in the generality of writers, I cannot but think, that it will be doing real ſervice to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory to produce ſome of theſe diſcoveries, as this may encourage the learned and induſtrious to purſue the plan that I have thus begun, and to compleat the hiſtory of the Latin church by diſpelling the darkneſs of what is called, the *Middle Age*. And indeed I may venture to affirm, that I have brought to light ſeveral things hitherto generally unknown, corrected from records of undoubted authority accounts of other things known but imperfectly and expreſſed with much perplexity and confuſion, and expoſed the fabulous nature of many events that deform the annals of ſacred hiſtory. I here perhaps carry too far that ſelf-praiſe, which the candour and indulgence of the public are diſpoſed either to overlook as the infirmity, or to regard as the privilege, of old age. Thoſe, however, who are curious to know how far this ſelf-applauſe is juſt and well-grounded, have only to caſt an eye on the illuſtrations I have given on the ſubject of CONSTANTINE's *Donation*, as alſo with reſpect to the *Cathari* and *Albigenſes*, the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, the *Brethren* and *Siſters of the Free Spirit* (whoſe peſtilential fanaticiſm was a public nuiſance to many countries in *Europe* during the ſpace of four hundred years), the *Fratricelli* or *Little Brethren*, the controverſies between the *Franciſcans* and the *Roman Pontifs*, the hiſtory of BERENGER and the *Lollards*, and other matters. When my illuſtrations on theſe ſubjects and points of hiſtory are compared with what we find concerning them in other writers, it will perhaps appear, that my pretenſions to the merit of ſome intereſting diſcoveries are not entirely without foundation.

Theſe acceſſions to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory could not be exhibited with the ſame brevity which I have obſerved in treating other ſubjects that have already been amply enlarged upon by others; for this would have been incompatible with the information of the curious, who would have received but imperfect and confuſed notions of theſe ſubjects, and would have made me, perhaps, paſs for a fabulous writer, who advanced novelties without mentioning either my guides or my authorities. I have, therefore, not only explained all thoſe points of hiſtory which carry with them an appearance of novelty, or recede conſiderably from the notions commonly received, but have alſo confirmed them by a ſufficient number of obſervations and teſtimonies to eſtabliſh their credibility on a ſolid foundation. The illuſtrations and enlargements, which, generally ſpeaking, carry an air of diſproportion and ſuperfluity in an hiſtorical abridgment, were abſolutely neceſſary in the preſent caſe.

Theſe reaſons engaged me to change the plan laid down in my former work, and one peculiar conſideration induced me to render the preſent hiſtory more ample and voluminous. The *Elements*, ſo often mentioned, were deſigned principally for the uſe of thoſe who are appointed to inſtruct the ſtudious youth in the hiſtory and viciſſitudes of the Chriſtian church, and who ſtand in need of a compendious text to give a certain order and method to their prelections. In this view I treated each ſubject with the utmoſt brevity, and left, as was natural and fitting, much to the learning and abilities of thoſe who ſhould think proper to make uſe of theſe *Elements* in their courſe of inſtruction. But in reviewing this compendious work with a deſign to offer it anew to the public, I imagined it might be rendered more acceptable to many by ſuch improvements and additions as might adapt it not only to the uſe of thoſe who teach others, but alſo of thoſe who are deſirous of acquiring, by their own application, a general knowledge of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. It was with this view that I made conſiderable additions to my former work, illuſtrated many things that had been there obſcurely expreſſed for the ſake of brevity, and reduced to a regular and perſpicuous order a variety of facts, the recital of which had been more or leſs attended with perplexity and confuſion. Hence it is, that in the following work the hiſtory of the calamities, in which the Chriſtians of the firſt ages were involved, and the origin and progreſs of the ſects and hereſies which troubled the church, are exhibited with an uncommon degree of accuracy and preciſion.

Hence the various forms of religion, which have ſprung from the exceſſive love of novelty, are repreſented without prejudice or partiality, and with all poſſible perſpicuity and truth. It is alſo in conſequence of this change of my original deſign, that I have taken the utmoſt pains to ſtate more clearly religious controverſies, to eſtimate their reſpective moment and importance, and to exhibit the arguments alledged on both ſides: nor muſt I omit mentioning the care and labour I have employed in giving an exact narration of the tranſactions, wars, and enterprizing meaſures, of the Roman pontifs, from the reign of CHARLEMAGNE down to the preſent times.

Thoſe, therefore, who are prevented from applying themſelves to a regular ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory through want of leiſure, or by not having at hand the ſources of inſtruction, and are nevertheleſs deſirous of acquiring a diſtinct knowledge of certain events, doctrines, or religious rites, may conſult the following work, in which they will find the information they want; and thoſe who are inclined to puſh their inquiries ſtill further, will ſee the courſe they muſt purſue, and the authors mentioned whom it will be proper for them to peruſe.

It would betray an unpardonable preſumption in me to imagine, that in a work, whoſe plan is ſo extenſive and whoſe contents are ſo various, I have never fallen into any miſtakes, or let any thing drop from my pen, which ſtands in need of correction. But as I am conſcious to myſelf of having conducted this undertaking with the moſt upright intentions, and of having employed all thoſe means that are generally looked upon as the beſt preſervatives againſt the ſeduction of error, I would hope that the miſtakes I may have committed are neither ſo frequent nor ſo momentous as to be productive of any pernicious effects.

I might add more; but nothing more is neceſſary to enable thoſe to judge of this work, who judge with knowledge, impartiality, and candour. I therefore conclude, by offering the juſt tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who, amidſt the infirmities of my advanced years and other preſſures under which I have laboured, has ſupplied me with ſtrength to bring this difficult work to a concluſion.

Gottingen,
March 23, 1755.

INTRO-

INTRODUCTION.

Definition of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

I. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY is a clear and faithful narration of the tranſactions, revolutions, and events, that relate to that large community, which bears the name of JESUS CHRIST, and is vulgarly known under the denomination of the CHURCH. It comprehends both the *external* and *internal* condition of this community, and ſo connects each event with the cauſes from which it proceeds, and the inſtruments which have been concerned in its production, that the attentive reader may be led to obſerve the diſplays of providential wiſdom and goodneſs in the preſervation of the church, and thus find his piety improved, as well as his knowledge.

Diviſion of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory into External and Internal.

II. The church, founded by the miniſtry and death of CHRIST, cannot be repreſented with more perſpicuity and propriety than under the notion of a ſociety ſubjected to a lawful dominion, and governed by certain laws and inſtitutions, moſtly of a moral and ſpiritual tendency. To ſuch a ſociety many external events muſt happen, which will advance or oppoſe its intereſts, and accelerate or retard its progreſs towards perfection, in conſequence of its unavoidable connexion with the courſe and revolutions of human affairs. Moreover, as nothing is ſtable and uniform where the imperfections of humanity take place, this religious ſociety, beſides the viciſſitudes to which it muſt be expoſed from the influence of external events, muſt be liable to various changes in its internal conſtitution. In this view of things then it appears, that the hiſtory of the church, like that of the ſtate, may be divided, with propriety, into two general branches, which we may call its *External* and *Internal* hiſtory.

The External, comprehends the proſperous and calamitous events that happened to the church.

III. The *External* hiſtory of the church comprehends all the changes, viciſſitudes, and events, that have diverſified the external ſtate and condition of this ſacred community. And as all public ſocieties have their periods of luſtre and decay, and are expoſed to revolutions both of a happy and calamitous nature, ſo this firſt branch of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory may be ſubdivided into two, comprehending, reſpectively, the *proſperous* and *calamitous* events that have happened to the church.

Proſperous events.

IV. The proſperous events, that have contributed to extend the limits, or to augment the influence, of the Chriſtian church, have proceeded either from its rulers and leaders, or from the ſubordinate members of this great community. Under the former claſs, we rank its *public* rulers, ſuch as princes, magiſtrates, and pontifs, who, by their authority and laws, their liberality, and even their arms, have maintained its cauſe and extended its borders, as alſo its more *private* leaders, its learned and pious doctors, whoſe wiſe counſels, pious exploits, eminent examples, and diſtinguiſhed abilities, have contributed moſt to promote its *true* proſperity and luſtre. Under the latter claſs, we may comprehend the advantages, which the cauſe of Chriſtianity has derived, from the active faith, the invincible conſtancy, the fervent piety and extenſive charity, of its genuine profeſſors, who, by the attractive luſtre of theſe amiable virtues, have led many into the way of truth, and engaged them to ſubmit themſelves to the empire of the MESSIAH.

Calamitous events.

V. Under the *calamitous* events that have happened to the church, may be comprehended the injuries it has received from the vices and paſſions of its friends, and the bitter oppoſition and inſidious ſtratagems of its enemies. The profeſſors of Chriſtianity, and more eſpecially the doctors and rulers of the church, have done unſpeakable detriment to the cauſe of religion, by their ignorance and ſloth, their luxury and ambition, their uncharitable zeal, animoſities and contentions, of which many ſhocking examples will be exhibited in the courſe of this hiſtory. Chriſtianity had *public* enemies to encounter, even princes and magiſtrates who, oppoſed its progreſs by penal laws and blood-thirſty perſecution; it had alſo private and inveterate adverſaries in a certain ſet of philoſophers, or rather ſophiſts, who, enſlaved to ſuperſtition or abandoned to atheiſm, endeavoured to blaſt the riſing church by their perfidious accuſations and their virulent writings.

Internal Hiſtory, which comprehends,

VI. Such then are the events that are exhibited to our view in the external hiſtory of the church. Its *Internal Hiſtory* comprehends the changes and viciſſitudes that have happened in its inward conſtitution, in that ſyſtem of diſcipline and doctrine by which it ſtands diſtinguiſhed from all other religious ſocieties. This branch may be properly termed the *Hiſtory of the Chriſtian Religion.* The cauſes of theſe internal changes are to be ſought for principally in the conduct and meaſures of thoſe who have preſided and born rule in the church. It has been too frequently their practice to interpret the truths and precepts of religion in a manner accommodated to their particular ſyſtems, nay, to their private intereſt; and while they have found in ſome implicit obedience, they have met with warm oppoſition from others. Hence have proceeded theological broils and civil commotions, in which the cauſe of religion has often been defended at the expence both of juſtice and humanity. All theſe things muſt be obſerved with the ſtricteſt attention by an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian.

Firſt, the hiſtory of the Chriſtian doctors.

VII. The firſt thing, therefore, that ſhould be naturally treated in the *Internal Hiſtory* of the church, is the hiſtory of its miniſters, rulers, and form of government. When we look back to the commencement of the Chriſtian church, we find its government adminiſtred jointly by the paſtors and the people. But, in proceſs of time, the ſcene changes, and we ſee theſe paſtors affecting an air of pre-eminence and ſuperiority, trampling upon the rights and privileges of the community, and aſſuming to themſelves a ſupreme authority both in civil and religious matters. This invaſion of the rights of the people was at length carried to ſuch a height, that a ſingle man adminiſtred, or at leaſt pretended a right to adminiſter, the affairs of the whole church with an unlimited ſway.—Among the doctors of theſe early times, there were ſome who acquired, by their learned labours, a ſhining reputation and an univerſal influence; they were regarded as oracles; their deciſions were handed down to poſterity as ſacred rules of faith and practice; and they thus deſerve to be mentioned, with particular diſtinction, among the governors of the church, though no part of its public adminiſtration was actually in their hands [*a*].

Secondly, the hiſtory of the doctrines and laws of the church.

VIII. After giving an account of the rulers and doctors of the church, the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian proceeds to exhibit a view of the *laws*, that are peculiar to this ſacred community, that form, as it were, its center of union, and diſtinguiſh it from all other religious ſocieties. Theſe *laws* are of two kinds. The firſt are properly called *divine*, becauſe they are immediately enacted by God himſelf, and are contained in thoſe ſacred books, which carry the moſt ſtriking marks of a divine origin. They conſiſt of thoſe *doctrines* that are the objects of faith and reaſon, and thoſe *precepts* that are addreſſed to the heart and the affections. To the ſecond kind belong thoſe *laws* that are merely of human inſtitution, and derive their authority only from the injunctions of the rulers of the church.

Rules neceſſary to be obſerved in giving a hiſtory of the doctrines of the Chriſtian church.

IX. In that part of the ſacred hiſtory which relates to the doctrines of Chriſtianity, it is neceſſary, above all things, to inquire particularly into the degree of authority that has been attributed to the ſacred writings in all the different periods of the church, and alſo into the manner in which the divine doctrines they contain, have been explained and illuſtrated. For the true ſtate of religion in every age can only be learned from the point of view in which theſe celeſtial oracles were conſidered, and from the manner in which they were expounded to the people. As long as they were the only rule of faith, religion preſerved is native purity; and, in proportion as their deciſions were either neglected or poſtponed to the inventions of men, it degenerated from its primitive and divine ſimplicity. It is further neceſſary to ſhew under this head, what was the fate of the pure laws and doctrines of Chriſtianity—how they were interpreted and explained—how they were defended againſt the enemies of the Goſpel — how they were corrupted and adulterated by the ignorance and licentiouſneſs of men. And, finally, it will be proper to inquire here, how far the lives and manners of Chriſtians have been conformable to the dictates of theſe ſacred laws, and the influence that theſe ſublime doctrines ought to have upon the hearts of men, as alſo to examine the rules of diſcipline preſcribed by the ſpiritual governors of the church, in order to correct and reſtrain the vices and irregularities of its members.

Thirdly, the hiſtory of its ceremonies and worſhip.

X. The *Human Laws*, that conſtitute a part of eccleſiaſtical government, conſiſt in precepts concerning the exernal worſhip of the Deity, and, in certain rites, either confirmed by cuſtom or introduced by poſitive and expreſs authority. *Rites* and *ceremonies* regard religion either *directly* or *indirectly*; by the former, we underſtand thoſe that are uſed in the immediate worſhip of the ſupreme Being, whether in public or in private; by the latter, ſuch pi-

---

[(*a*) By theſe our author means the *Fathers*, whoſe writings form ſtill a rule of faith in the Romiſh church, while in the Proteſtant churches their authority diminiſhes from day to day.]

ous and decent inſtitutions as, beſides direct acts of worſhip, have obtained in the church. This part of ſacred hiſtory is of a vaſt extent, both on account of the great diverſity of theſe ceremonies and the frequent changes and modifications through which they have paſſed. This conſideration will juſtify our treating them with brevity, in a work which is only deſigned as a compendious view of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.

Fourthly, the hiſtory of the hereſies that have divided it.

XI. As bodies politic are ſometimes diſtracted with wars and ſeditions, ſo has the Chriſtian church, though deſigned to be the manſion of charity and concord, been unhappily perplexed by inteſtine diviſions, occaſioned ſometimes by points of doctrine, at others by a variety of ſentiments about certain rites and ceremonies. The principal authors of theſe diviſions have been ſtigmatized with the title of *Heretics*, and their peculiar opinions of conſequence diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of *Hereſies* [*b*]. The nature therefore and progreſs of theſe inteſtine diviſions or *hereſies* are to be carefully unfolded; and, if this be done with judgment and impartiality, it muſt prove uſeful and intereſting in the higheſt degree, though at the ſame time it muſt be obſerved, that no branch of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory is ſo painful and difficult, on account of the ſagacity candour, and application that it requires, in order to its being treated in a ſatisfactory manner. The difficulty of arriving at the truth, in reſearches of this nature, is extreme, on account of the injurious treatment that has been ſhewn to the heads of religious ſects, and the unfair repreſentations that have been given of their tenets and opinions; and this difficulty has been conſiderably augmented by this particular circumſtance, that the greateſt part of the writings of thoſe who were branded with the name of heretics have not reached our times. It is therefore the duty of a candid hiſtorian to avoid attaching to this term the invidious ſenſe in which it is too often uſed, ſince it is the invective of all contending parties, and is employed againſt truth, as frequently as againſt error. The wiſeſt method here is to take the word *Heretic* in its general ſignification, as denoting a perſon, who, either directly or indirectly, has been the occaſion of exciting diviſions and diſſenſions among Chriſtians.

In treating Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, events are to conſidered in connexion with their cauſes.

XII. After thus conſidering what conſtitutes the *matter* of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, it will be proper to beſtow a few thoughts on the *manner* of treating it, as this is a point of too much importance not to deſerve a moment's attention. And here we may obſerve, that, in order to render both the External and Internal Hiſtory of the Church truly intereſting and uſeful, it is abſolutely neceſſary to trace effects to their cauſes, and to connect events with the circumſtances, views, principles, and inſtruments that have contributed to their exiſtence. A bare recital of facts can at beſt but enrich the *memory*, and furniſh a certain degree of amuſement; but the hiſtorian, who enters into the ſecret ſprings that direct the courſe of outward events, and views things in their various relations, connexions, and tendencies, gives thus a proper exerciſe to the *judgement* of the reader, and adminiſters, on many

---

[(*b*) A term innocent in its primitive ſignification, though become odious by the enormity of ſome errors, to which it has been applied, and alſo by the uſe that has been made of it, to vent the malignity of enthuſiaſts and bigots.]

occaſions, the moſt uſeful leſſons of wiſdom and prudence. It is true, a high degree of caution is to be obſerved here, leſt, in diſcloſing the ſecret ſprings of public events, we ſubſtitute imaginary cauſes in the place of real, and attribute the actions of men to principles they never profeſſed.

General method of inveſtigating the ſecret cauſes of things.

XIII. In order to diſcover the ſecret cauſes of public events, ſome general ſuccours are to be derived from the *Hiſtory of the times* in which they happened, and the *Teſtimonies of the authors* by whom they are recorded. But beſides theſe, a conſiderable *acquaintance with human nature*, founded on long obſervation and experience, is ſingularly uſeful in reſearches of this kind. The hiſtorian, who has acquired a competent knowledge of the views that occupy the generality of men, who has ſtudied a great variety of characters, and attentively obſerved the force and violence of human paſſions, together with the infirmities and contradictions they produce in the conduct of life, will find, in this knowledge, a key to the ſecret reaſons and motives which gave riſe to many of the moſt important events of ancient times. A knowledge alſo of the *manners* and *opinions* of the perſons concerned in the events that are related, will contribute much to lead us to the true origin of things.

More particular rules for coming to this knowledge in the External Hiſtory of the church.

XIV. There are however, beſides theſe general views, particular conſiderations, which will aſſiſt us ſtill further in tracing up to their true cauſes the various events of ſacred hiſtory. We muſt, for example, in the External Hiſtory of the church, attend carefully to two things, *firſt*, to the political ſtate of thoſe kingdoms and nations in which the Chriſtian religion has been embraced or rejected; and, *ſecondly*, to their religious ſtate, *i. e.* the opinions they have entertained concerning the divine nature and the worſhip that is to be addreſſed to him. For we ſhall then perceive, with more certainty and leſs difficulty, the reaſons of the different reception Chriſtianity has met with in different nations, when we are acquainted with the reſpective forms of civil government, the political maxims, and the public forms of religion that prevailed in thoſe countries and in thoſe periods of time in which the Goſpel received encouragement, or met with oppoſition.

And in its Internal Hiſtory.

XV. With reſpect to the *Internal Hiſtory of the Church*, nothing is more adapted to lay open to view the hidden ſprings of its various changes, than an acquaintance with the *Hiſtory of learning and philoſophy* in the times of old. For it is certain, that human learning and philoſophy have, in all times, pretended to modify the doctrines of Chriſtianity; and that theſe pretenſions have extended further than belongs to the province of philoſophy on the one hand, or is conſiſtent with the purity and ſimplicity of the Goſpel on the other. It may alſo be obſerved, that a knowledge of the forms of civil government and of the ſuperſtitious rites and inſtitutions of ancient times is not only uſeful, as we remarked above, to illuſtrate ſeveral things in the External Hiſtory of the church, but alſo to render a ſatisfactory account of its *Internal* variations both in point of doctrine and worſhip. For the genius of human laws and the maxims of civil rulers have undoubtedly had a great influence in forming the conſtitution of the church; and even its ſpiritual leaders have, in too many inſtances, from an ill-judged prudence, modelled its diſcipline and worſhip after the ancient ſuperſtitions.

The ſources from whence Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory muſt be derived.

XVI. We cannot be at any loſs to know the ſources from whence this important knowledge is to be derived. The beſt writers of every age, who make mention of eccleſiaſtical affairs, and particularly thoſe who were contemporary with the events they relate, are to be carefully conſulted, ſince it is from credible teſtimonies and reſpectable authorities that hiſtory derives a ſolid and permanent foundation. Our eſteem for thoſe writers who may be conſidered as the ſources of hiſtorical knowledge, ought not however to lead us to treat with neglect the hiſtorians and annaliſts, who have already made uſe of theſe original records; ſince it betrays a fooliſh ſort of vanity to reject the advantages that may be derived from the ſuccours and labours of thoſe who have preceded us in their endeavours to caſt light upon matters that have been for many ages covered with obſcurity [c].

The eſſential qualities of an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

XVII. From all this we ſhall eaſily diſcern the qualifications that are eſſential to a good writer of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. His knowledge of human affairs muſt be conſiderable, and his learning extenſive. He muſt be endowed with a ſpirit of obſervation and ſagacity; a habit of reaſoning with evidence and facility; a faithful memory; and a judgment matured by experience, and ſtrengthened by exerciſe. Such are the intellectual endowments that are required in the character of a good hiſtorian, and the moral qualities that are neceſſary to complete it, are a perſevering and inflexible attachment to truth and virtue, a freedom from the ſervitude of prejudice and paſſion, and a laborious and patient turn of mind.

An hiſtorian muſt be free from a ſervile attachment to times, men, and opinions.

XVIII. Thoſe who undertake to write the hiſtory of the Chriſtian church are expoſed to receive a biaſs from three different ſources, from *times*, *perſons*, and *opinions*. The *times*, in which we live, have often ſo great an influence on our manner of judging, as to make us conſider the events, which happen in our days, as a rule by which we are to eſtimate the probability or evidence of thoſe that are recorded in the hiſtory of paſt ages. The *perſons*, on whoſe teſtimonies we think we have reaſon to depend, acquire an imperceptible authority over our ſentiments, that too frequently ſeduces us to adopt their errors, eſpecially if theſe perſons have been diſtinguiſhed by eminent degrees of ſanctity and virtue. And an attachment to favourite *opinions* leads authors ſometimes to pervert, or, at leaſt, to modify facts in favour of thoſe who have embraced theſe opinions, or to the diſadvantage of ſuch as have oppoſed them. Theſe kinds of ſeduction are ſo much the more dangerous, that thoſe whom they deceive are, in innumerable caſes, inſenſible of their deluſion and of the falſe repreſentations of things to which it leads them. It is not neceſſary to obſerve the ſolemn obligations that bind an hiſtorian to guard againſt theſe three ſources of error with the moſt delicate circumſpection, and the moſt ſcrupulous attention.

---

[c] The various writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory are enumerated by SEVER. WALT. SLUTERUS in his *Propylæum Hiſtoriæ Chriſtianæ*, publiſhed at *Lunenburg* in 4^{to}. in the year 1696; and by CASP. SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introductio ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſticam, ſingulaſque ejus partes*.

XIX. It

The defects that are viſible in the writers of Church hiſtory.

XIX. It is well known nevertheleſs how far eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, in all ages, have departed from theſe rules and from others of equal evidence and importance. For not to mention thoſe who lay claim to a high rank among the writers of hiſtory in conſequence of a happy memory, loaded with an ample heap of materials, nor thoſe whoſe pens are rather guided by ſordid views of intereſt than by a generous love of truth, it is but too evident, how few in number the unprejudiced and impartial hiſtorians, are whom neither the influence of the ſect to which they belong, nor the venerable and impoſing names of antiquity, nor the ſpirit of the times and the torrent of prevailing *opinion* can turn aſide from the obſtinate purſuit of truth *alone*. In the preſent age, more eſpecially, the ſpirit of the times and the influence of predominant opinions have gained with many an incredible aſcendant. Hence we find frequently in the writings even of learned men ſuch wretched arguments as theſe: *Such an opinion is true*; *therefore it muſt of neceſſity have been adopted by the primitive Chriſtians*—*Chriſt has commanded us to live in ſuch a manner*; *therefore it is undoubtedly certain, that the Chriſtians of ancient times lived ſo.*—*A certain cuſtom does not take place now*; *therefore it did not prevail in former times.*

The advantages that reſult from the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.—General.

XX. If thoſe who apply themſelves to the compoſition of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory are careful to avoid the ſources of error mentioned above, their labours will be eminently uſeful to mankind, and more eſpecially to thoſe who are called to the important office of inſtructing others in the ſacred truths and duties of Chriſtianity. The hiſtory of the church preſents to our view a variety of objects that are every way adapted to confirm our faith. When we contemplate here the diſcouraging obſtacles, the united efforts of kingdoms and empires, and the dreadful calamities which Chriſtianity, in its very infancy, was obliged to encounter, and over which it gained an immortal victory, this will be ſufficient to fortify its true and zealous profeſſors againſt all the threats, cavils, and ſtratagems of profane and impious men. The great and ſhining examples alſo which diſplay their luſtre, more or leſs, in every period of the Chriſtian hiſtory, muſt have an admirable tendency to inflame our piety and to excite, even in the coldeſt and moſt inſenſible hearts, the love of God and virtue. Thoſe amazing revolutions and events that diſtinguiſhed every age of the church, and often ſeemed to ariſe from ſmall beginnings and cauſes of little conſequence, proclaim, with a ſolemn and reſpectable voice, the empire of providence, and alſo the inconſtancy and vanity of human things. And, among the many advantages that ariſe from the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, it is none of the leaſt, that we ſhall ſee therein the origin and occaſions of thoſe ridiculous rites, abſurd opinions, fooliſh ſuperſtitions, and pernicious errors, with which Chriſtianity is yet disfigured in too many parts of the world. This knowledge will naturally lead us to a view of the truth in its beautiful ſimplicity, will engage us to love it and render us zealous in its defence; not to mention the pleaſure and ſatisfaction that we muſt feel in reſearches and diſcoveries of ſuch an intereſting kind.

And particular.

XXI. They, more eſpecially, who are appointed to inſtruct the youth in the public univerſities, as alſo ſuch as are ſet apart for the ſervice of the church, will derive from this ſtudy the moſt uſeful leſſons of wiſdom and prudence, to direct them in the diſcharge of their reſpective offices. On the one hand, the inconſiderate zeal and temerity of others, and the pernicious conſequences with which they have been attended, will teach circumſpection; and in the miſtakes into which, even men of eminent merit and abilities have fallen, they will often ſee the things they are obliged to avoid, and the ſacrifices it will be prudent to make, in order to maintain peace and concord in the church; on the other, illuſtrious examples and ſalutary meaſures will hold forth to them a rule of conduct, a lamp to ſhew them the paths they muſt purſue. It may be further obſerved, that, if we except the arms which ſcripture and reaſon furniſh againſt ſuperſtition and error, there is nothing that will enable us to combat them with more efficacy than the view of their deplorable effects, as they are repreſented to us in the hiſtory of the church. It would be endleſs to enumerate all the advantages that reſult from the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; experience alone can diſplay theſe in all their extent; nor ſhall we mention the benefits that may be derived from it by thoſe who have turned their views to other ſciences than that of theology, and its more peculiar utility to ſuch as are engaged in the ſtudy of the civil law. All this would lead us too far from our preſent deſign.

The method of treating Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, in its External and Internal branches.

XXII. As the hiſtory of the church is *External* or *Internal*, ſo the manner of treating it muſt be ſuited to that diviſion. As to the firſt, when the narration is long and the thread of the hiſtory runs through a great number of ages, it is proper to divide it into certain periods, which will give the reader time to breathe, aſſiſt memory, and alſo introduce a certain method and order into the work. In the following hiſtory the uſual diviſion into centuries is adopted preferably to all others, becauſe moſt generally liked; though it be attended with difficulties and inconveniencies.

XXIII. A conſiderable part of theſe inconveniencies will be however removed, if, beſides this ſmaller diviſion into centuries, we adopt a larger one, and divide the ſpace of time that elapſed between the birth of CHTIST and our days into certain grand periods, that are diſtinguiſhed by ſignal revolutions or remarkable events. It is on this account that we have judged it expedient to comprehend the following Hiſtory in FOUR BOOKS, that will take in four remarkable periods: The FIRST will be employed in exhibiting the ſtate and viciſſitudes of the Chriſtian church, from its commencement to the time of CONSTANTINE the Great. The SECOND will comprehend the period, that extends from the reign of CONSTANTINE to that of CHARLEMAGNE, which produced ſuch a remarkable change in the face of *Europe*. The THIRD will contain the Hiſtory of the Church, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE to the memorable period when LUTHER aroſe in *Germany*, to oppoſe the tyranny of *Rome* and to deliver divine truth from the darkneſs that covered it. And the FOURTH will carry down the ſame hiſtory, from the riſe of LUTHER to the preſent times.

XXIV. We have ſeen above, that the ſphere of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is extenſive, that it comprehends a great variety of objects, and embraces political, as well as religious, matters, ſo far as the former are related to the latter, either as cauſes or effects. But, however great the diverſity of theſe objects may be, they are cloſely connected; and it is the particular buſineſs of an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian to obſerve a method that will ſhew this connexion in the moſt conſpicuous point of view, and form into one regular *whole* a variety of parts that ſeem heterogeneous and diſcordant. Different writers have followed here different methods, according to the diverſity of their views and their peculiar manner of thinking. The order I have obſerved will be ſeen above in that part of this *Introduction*, which treats of the ſubject-matter of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; the mention of it is therefore omitted here, to avoid unneceſſary repetitions.

A COMPENDIOUS VIEW OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BOOK I.

Containing the HISTORY of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH from its firſt riſe to the time of CONSTANTINE the GREAT.

PART I.

Comprehending the External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the civil and religious ſtate of the world at the birth of CHRIST.

CENT. I.

The ſtate of the Roman empire.

I. A GREAT part of the world was become ſubject to the Roman empire, when JESUS CHRIST made his appearance upon earth. The remoter nations, which had ſubmitted to the yoke of this mighty empire, were ruled, either by Roman governors inveſted with temporary commiſſions, or by their own princes and laws, in ſubordination to the republic, whoſe ſovereignty was to be acknowledged, and from which the conquered kings, that were continued in their dominions, derived their borrowed majeſty. At the ſame time the Roman people and their venerable ſenate, though they had not loſt all ſhadow of liberty, were yet, in reality, reduced to a ſtate of ſervile ſubmiſſion to AUGUSTUS CÆSAR, who, by artifice, perfidy, and blood-ſhed, had proceeded to an enormous degree of power, and united in his own perſon the pompous titles of Emperor, Sovereign

Pontif, Cenſor, Tribune of the people, Proconſul; in a word, all the great offices of the ſtate [a].

The inconveniences, which proceeded from the corrupt adminiſtration of its magiſtrates.

II. The Roman government, conſidered both with reſpect to its form and its laws, was certainly mild and equitable [b]. But the injuſtice and avarice of the Prætors and Proconſuls, and the ambitious luſt of conqueſt and dominion, which was the predominant paſſion of the Roman people, together with the rapacious proceedings of the Publicans, by whom the taxes of the empire were levied, were the occaſions of perpetual tumults and unſupportable grievances. And among the many evils that aroſe from thence we juſtly reckon the formidable armies, that were neceſſary to ſupport theſe extortions in the provinces, and the civil wars, which frequently broke out between the oppreſſed nations, and their haughty conquerors.

The advantages, which aroſe from its extent.

III. It muſt, at the ſame time, be acknowledged, that this ſupreme dominion of one people, or rather, of one man over ſo many kingdoms, was attended with many conſiderable advantages to mankind in general, and to the propagation and advancement of Chriſtianity in particular. For, by the means of this almoſt univerſal empire, many nations, different in their language, and in their manners, were united more intimately together in ſocial intercourſe. Hence a paſſage was opened to the remoteſt countries by the communications, which the Romans formed between the conquered provinces [c]. Hence alſo the nations, whoſe manners were ſavage and barbarous, were civilized by the laws and commerce of the Romans. And by this, in ſhort, the benign influence of letters and philoſophy was ſpred abroad in countries, which had lain, before, under the darkeſt ignorance. And all this contributed, no doubt, in a ſingular manner, to facilitate the progreſs of the Goſpel, and to crown the labours of its firſt miniſters and heralds with ſucceſs [d].

The Roman empire enjoys peace.

IV. The Roman empire, at the birth of CHRIST, was leſs agitated by wars and tumults, than it had been for many years before. For, though I cannot aſſent to the opinion of thoſe, who, following the account of OROSIUS, maintain, that the temple of JANUS was then ſhut, and that wars and diſcords abſolutely ceaſed throughout the world [e]; yet it is certain, that the period, in which our Saviour deſcended upon earth, may be juſtly ſtyled the *Pacific Age*, if we compare it with the preceding times. And indeed, the tranquillity, that then reigned, was neceſſary to enable the miniſters of CHRIST to execute, with ſucceſs, their ſublime commiſſion to the human race.

---

[a] See for this purpoſe the learned work of AUGUSTIN. CAMPIANUS, entitled, *De officio et poteſtate Magiſtratuum Romanorum et juriſdictione*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 3, 4, &c. *Genevæ*, 1725, in Quarto.

[b] See MOYLE's *Eſſay on the Conſtitution of the Roman Government* in the poſthumous works of that author, vol. i. p. 1—48. as alſo SCIP. MAFFAEI *Verona illuſtrata*, lib. ii. p. 65.

[c] See, for a further illuſtration of this matter, *Hiſtoire des grands chemins de l'Empire Romain*, par NICOL. BERGIER, printed in the year 1728. See alſo the very learned EVERARD OTTO, *De tutela viarum Publicarum*, part II. p. 314.

[d] ORIGEN, among others, makes particular mention of this, in the ſecond book of his anſwer to CELSUS, p. 79. of the *Cambridge* edition.

[e] See JO. MASSONI *Templum Jani, Chriſto naſcente, reſeratum.* Roterodami, 1706.

The ſtate of the other nations.

V. The want of ancient records renders it impoſſible to ſay any thing ſatisfactory or certain concerning the ſtate of thoſe nations, who did not receive the Roman yoke: nor indeed is their hiſtory eſſential to our preſent purpoſe. It is ſufficient to obſerve, with reſpect to them, that thoſe who inhabited the eaſtern regions were ſtangers to the ſweets of liberty, and groaned under the burthen of an oppreſſive yoke. This, their ſoftneſs and effeminacy, both in point of manners and bodily conſtitution, contributed to make them ſupport with an unmanly patience; and even the religion, they profeſſed, riveted their chains. On the contrary, the northern nations enjoyed, in their frozen dwellings, the bleſſings of ſacred freedom, which their government, their religion, a robuſt and vigorous frame of body and ſpirit, derived from the inclemency and ſeverity of their climate, all united to preſerve and maintain [*f*].

All ſunk in ſuperſtition.

VI. All thoſe nations lived in the practice of the moſt abominable ſuperſtitions. For though the notion of one ſupreme being was not entirely effaced in the human mind, but ſhewed itſelf frequently, even through the darkneſs of the groſſeſt idolatry, yet, all nations, except that of the Jews, acknowledged a number of governing powers whom they called Gods, and one or more of which they ſuppoſed to preſide over each particular province or people. They worſhiped theſe fictitious deities with various rites; they conſidered them as widely different from each other in ſex, and power, in their nature, and alſo in their reſpective offices, and they appeaſed them by a multiplicity of ceremonies and offerings, in order to obtain their protection and favour. So that, however different the degrees of enormity might be, with which this abſurd and impious theology appeared in different countries; yet there was no nation, whoſe ſacred rites and whoſe religious worſhip did not diſcover a manifeſt abuſe of reaſon, and very ſtriking marks of extravagance and folly.

But not of the ſame kind.

VII. Every nation then had its reſpective gods, over which preſided one more excellent than the reſt; yet in ſuch a manner, that this ſupreme deity was himſelf controlled by the rigid empire of the fates, or what the philoſophers called *Eternal neceſſity*. The gods of the eaſt were different from thoſe of the Gauls, the Germans, and the other northern nations. The Grecian divinities differed widely from thoſe of the Egyptians, who deified plants, animals, and a great variety of the productions, both of nature and art [*g*]. Each people alſo had their own particular manner of worſhiping and appeaſing their reſpective deities, entirely different from the ſacred rites of other countries. In proceſs of time, however, the Greeks and Romans grew as ambitious in their religious pretenſions, as in their political claims. They maintained that *their* gods, though under different names, were the objects of religious worſhip in all nations, and therefore they gave the names of their deities to thoſe of other countries [*b*]. This pretenſion, whether ſupported by ignorance, or other means, introduced inexpreſſible darkneſs and perplexity into the hiſtory of the antient ſuperſtitions, and has been alſo the occaſion of innumerable errors in the writings of the learned.

[*f*] *Fere itaque imperia* (ſays SENECA) *penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cœlo utuntur*: in frigora, *ſeptemtrionemque vergentibus immanſueta ingenia ſunt, ut ait poeta*, ſuoque ſimillima cœlo. SENECA *De ira*, lib. ii. cap. xvi. tom. i. *Opp. Edit. Gronovii.*

[*g*] See the diſcourſe of ATHANASIUS, entitled, *Oratio contra gentes*, in the firſt volume of his works.

No wars nor diſſenſions occaſioned by this variety of religions.

VIII. One thing, indeed, which, at firſt ſight, appears very remarkable, is, that this variety of religions and of gods neither produced wars nor diſſenſions among the different nations, the Egyptians excepted [*i*]. Nor is it, perhaps, neceſſary to except even them, ſince their wars undertaken for their gods cannot be looked upon, with propriety, as wholly of a religious nature [*k*]. Each nation ſuffered its neighbours to follow their own method of worſhip, to adore their own gods, to enjoy their own rites and ceremonies, and diſcovered no ſort of diſpleaſure at their diverſity of ſentiments in religious matters. There is, however, little wonderful in this ſpirit of mutual toleration, when we conſider, that they all looked upon the world as one great empire, divided into various provinces, over every one of which a certain order of divinities preſided, and that, therefore, none could behold with contempt the gods of other nations, or force ſtrangers to pay homage to theirs. The Romans exerciſed this toleration in the ampleſt manner. For, though they would not allow any changes to be made in the religions that were publicly profeſſed in the empire, nor any new form of worſhip to be openly introduced, yet they granted to their citizens a full liberty of obſerving, in private, the ſacred rites of other nations, and of honouring foreign deities (whoſe worſhip contained nothing inconſiſtent with the intereſts and laws of the re-

---

[(*b*) This fact renders a ſatisfactory account of the vaſt number of gods who bore the name of Jupiter, and the multitudes that paſſed under thoſe of Mercury, Venus, Hercules, Juno, *&c.* The Greeks, when they found, in other countries, deities that reſembled their own, perſuaded the worſhipers of theſe foreign gods, that their deities were the ſame that were honoured in Greece, and were, indeed, convinced themſelves that this was the caſe. In conſequence of this, the Greeks gave the names of their gods to thoſe of other nations, and the Romans, in this, followed their example. Hence we find the names of Jupiter, Mars, Mercury, Venus, *&c.* frequently mentioned in the more recent monuments and inſcriptions which have been found among the Gauls and Germans, though the antient inhabitants of thoſe countries worſhiped no gods under ſuch denominations. I cannot think that this method of the Greeks and Romans has introduced ſo much confuſion into mythology as Dr. MOSHEIM here imagines. If indeed there was no reſemblance between the Greek and Roman deities, and thoſe of other nations, and if the names of the deities of the former had been given to thoſe of the latter in an arbitrary and undiſtinguiſhing manner, the reflexion of our hiſtorian would be undeniably true. But it has been alleged by many learned men, and that with a high degree of probability, that the principal deities of all nations reſembled each other extremely in their eſſential characters; and, if ſo, their receiving the ſame names could not introduce much confuſion into mythology, ſince they were probably derived from one common ſource. If the Thor of the antient Celts, was the ſame in dignity, character, and attributes with the Jupiter of the Greeks and Romans, where was the impropriety of giving the ſame name?]

[*i*] There are ingenious things to be found upon this head in the *Expoſitio Menſæ Iſiacæ* of PIGNORIUS, p. 41.

[(*k*) The religious wars of the Egyptians were not undertaken to compel others to adopt their worſhip, but to avenge the ſlaughter that was made of their gods, *viz.* Crocodiles, *&c*, by the neighbouring nations. They were not offended at their neighbours for ſerving other divinities, but could not bear, that they ſhould put theirs to death.]

public) with feaſts, temples, conſecrated groves, and ſuch like teſtimonies of homage and reſpect [l].

Moſt of their gods were departed heros.

IX. The deities of almoſt all nations were either antient heros, renowned for their noble exploits and worthy deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women, become illuſtrious by remarkable actions or uſeful inventions. The merit of theſe diſtinguiſhed and eminent perſons, contemplated by their poſterity with an enthuſiaſtic gratitude, was the reaſon of their being exalted to celeſtial honours. The natural world furniſhed another kind of deities, that were added to theſe by ſome nations. And as the ſun, moon, and ſtars ſhine forth with a luſtre ſuperior to that of all other material beings; ſo it is certain, that they particularly attracted the attention of mankind, and received religious homage from almoſt all the nations of the world [m]. From theſe beings of a nobler kind idolatry deſcended into an enormous multiplication of inferior powers; ſo that in many countries, the mountains, trees, and rivers, the earth, the ſea, and the winds, nay, even virtues, vices, and diſeaſes had their ſhrines attended by devout and zealous worſhipers [n].

The worſhip paid to theſe deities.

X. Theſe deities were honoured with rites and ſacrifices of various kinds, according to their reſpective nature and offices [o]. The rites uſed in their worſhip were abſurd and ridiculous, and frequently cruel and obſcene. Moſt nations offered animals, and ſome proceeded to the enormity of human ſacrifices. As to their prayers, they were void of piety and ſenſe both with reſpect to their matter and their form [p]. Pontifs, prieſts, and miniſters, diſtributed into ſeveral claſſes, preſided in this ſtrange worſhip, and were appointed to prevent diſorder in the performance of the ſacred rites. This *order*, which was ſuppoſed to be diſtinguiſhed by an immediate intercourſe and friendſhip with the gods, abuſed their authority in the baſeſt manner to deceive an ignorant and wretched people.

---

[l] See concerning this intereſting ſubject a very curious and learned treatiſe of the famous BYNCKERSHOECK, entitled, *Diſſertatio de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos.* This diſſertation is to be found in the *Opuſcula* of that excellent author, which were publiſhed at *Leyden* in Quarto, in the year 1719.

[m] The ingenious editor of the RUINS OF BALBEC has given us, in the preface to that noble work, a very curious account of the origin of the religious worſhip, that was offered to the heavenly bodies by the Syrians and Arabians. In thoſe uncomfortable deſarts, where the *day* preſents nothing to the view, but the uniform, tedious, and melancholy proſpect of barren ſands, the *night* diſcloſes a moſt delightful and magnificent ſpectacle, and appears arrayed with charms of the moſt attractive kind. For the moſt part unclouded and ſerene, it exhibits to the wondering eye the *Hoſt of heaven* in all their amazing variety and glory. In the view of this ſtupendous ſcene, the tranſition from admiration to idolatry was too eaſy to uninſtructed minds; and a people, whoſe climate offered no beauties to contemplate, but thoſe of the firmament, would naturally look thither for the objects of their worſhip. The form of idolatry, in Greece, was different from that of the Syrians; and Mr. WOOD ingeniouſly attributes this to that ſmiling and variegated ſcene of mountains, valleys, rivers, groves, woods, and fountains, which the tranſported imagination, in the midſt of its pleaſing aſtoniſhment, ſuppoſed to be the ſeats of inviſible deities. See a further account of this matter in the elegant work abovementioned.]

[n] See the learned work of J. G. VOSSIUS, *De idololatria.*

[o] See J. SAUBERTUS, *De ſacrificiis veterum.* Lug. Bat. 1699.

[p] See M. BROUERIUS a NIEDECK, *De adorationibus veterum populorum,* printed at *Utrecht* in 8vo. in the year 1711.

Confined to ſtated times and places.

XI. The religious worſhip we have now been conſidering, was confined to ſtated *times* and *places*. The ſtatues and other repreſentations of the gods were placed in the temples [*q*], and ſuppoſed to be animated in an incomprehenſible manner. For the votaries of theſe fictitious deities, however deſtitute they might be of reaſon in other reſpects, avoided carefully the imputation of worſhiping inanimate beings, ſuch as braſs, wood, and ſtone, and therefore pretended that the divinity, repreſented by the ſtatue, was really preſent in it, if the dedication was duly and properly made [*r*].

Myſteries.

XII. But, beſide the public worſhip of the gods to which all without exception were admitted, there were certain religious inſtitutions and rites celebrated in ſecret by the Greeks and ſeveral eaſtern nations, to which a very ſmall number were allowed acceſs. Theſe were commonly called *myſteries*; and the perſons, who deſired to be initiated therein, were obliged previouſly to exhibit ſatisfactory proofs of their fidelity and patience, by paſſing through various trials and ceremonies of the moſt diſagreeable kind. The ſecret of theſe inſtitutions was kept in the ſtricteſt manner, as the initiated could not reveal any thing that paſſed in them without expoſing their lives to the moſt imminent danger [*s*]; and that is the reaſon why, at this time, we are ſo little acquainted with the true nature, and the real deſign of theſe hidden rites. It is, however, well known, that, in ſome of thoſe *myſteries*, many things were tranſacted, that were contrary both to real modeſty, and outward decency. And, indeed, from the whole of the Pagan rites the intelligent few might eaſily learn, that the divinities generally worſhiped, were rather men famous for their vices, than diſtinguiſhed by virtuous and worthy deeds [*t*].

No tendency in Paganiſm to promote virtue.

XIII. It is, at leaſt, certain, that this religion had not the leaſt influence towards the exciting or nouriſhing ſolid and true virtue in the minds of men. For the gods and goddeſſes, to whom public homage was paid, exhibited to their worſhipers rather examples of egregious crimes, than of uſeful and illuſtrious virtues [*u*]. The gods, moreover, were eſteemed ſuperior to men in power and immortality; but, in every thing elſe, they were conſidered as their

---

[(*q*) Some nations were without temples, ſuch as the Perſians, Gauls, Germans, and Bretons, who performed their religious worſhip in the open air, or in the ſhady retreats of conſecrated groves.]

[*r*] See ARNOBIUS *adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254. according to the edition of Heraldus. See alſo AUGUSTIN. *De civitate Dei*, lib. vii. cap. xxxiii; and the *Miſopogon of the emperor* JULIAN, p. 361, according to the edition of Spanheim.

[*s*] See CLARKSON on the *Liturgies*, § iv. p. 36 as alſo MEURSIUS, *De myſteriis Eleuſiniis.*

[*t*] See CICERO *Diſput. Tuſculan* lib. ii. cap. xiii.

[*u*] There is a very remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe in the *Triſtia* of OVID, book the ſecond, beginning at the 287 line.

"Quis locus eſt templis auguſtior? hæc quoque vitet,
"In culpam ſi quæ eſt ingenioſa ſuam.
"Cum ſteterit Jovis æde: Jovis ſuccurret in æde,
"Quam multas matres fecerit ille Deus.
"Proxima adoranti Junonia templa ſubibit,
"Pellicibus multis hanc doluiſſe Deam.
"Pallade conſpecta, natum de crimine virgo
"Suſtulerit quare, quæret Ericthonium.

equals. The prieſts were little ſolicitous to animate the people to a virtuous conduct either by their precepts or their example; nay, they plainly enough declared, that all that was eſſential to the true worſhip of the gods was contained only in the rites and inſtitutions which the people had received by tradition from their anceſtors [*w*]. And as to what regarded the rewards of virtue and the puniſhment of vice after this preſent life, the general notions were partly uncertain, partly licentious, and often more proper to adminiſter indulgence to vice, than encouragement to virtue. Hence, the wiſer part of mankind, about the time of CHRIST's birth, looked upon this whole ſyſtem of religion as a juſt object of ridicule and contempt.

On the contrary, it promoted corruption of manners.

XIV. The conſequences of this wretched theology were a univerſal corruption of manners, which diſcovered itſelf in the impunity of the moſt flagitious crimes [*x*]. JUVENAL and PERSIUS among the Latins, and LUCIAN among the Greeks, bear teſtimony to the juſtice of this heavy accuſation. It is alſo well known, that no public law prohibited the ſports of the gladiators, the exerciſe of unnatural luſts, the licentiouſneſs of divorce, the cuſtom of expoſing infants, and of procuring abortions, nor the frontleſs atrocity of conſecrating publicly ſtews and brothels to certain divinities.

The arguments of the prieſts in defence of Paganiſm.

XV. Such, as were not ſunk in an unaccountable, and brutiſh ſtupidity, perceived the deformity of theſe religious ſyſtems. To theſe the crafty prieſts addreſſed two conſiderations to prevent their incredulity, and to diſpel their doubts. The firſt was drawn from the miracles and prodigies which they pretended were daily wrought in the temples, before the ſtatues of the gods and heros, that were placed there; and the ſecond was deduced from oracles and divination, by which they maintained that the ſecrets of futurity were unfolded through the interpoſition of the gods. In both theſe points the cunning of the prieſts impoſed miſerably upon the ignorance of the people; and, if the diſcerning few ſaw the cheat, they were obliged, from a regard to their own ſafety, to laugh with caution, ſince the prieſts were even ready to accuſe, before a raging and ſuperſtitious multitude, thoſe, who diſcovered their religious frauds, as rebels againſt the majeſty of the immortal gods.

The religion of the Greeks and Romans.

XVI. At the time of CHRIST's appearance upon earth, the religion of the Romans, as well as their arms, had extended itſelf through a great part of the world. This religion muſt be known to thoſe who are acquainted with the Grecian ſuperſtitions [*y*]. In ſome things, indeed, it differs from them; for the Romans, beſides the inſtitutions invented by NUMA and others, contrived with political views, added ſeveral Italic and Hetrurian fictions to the Grecian fables, and gave alſo to the Egyptian deities a place among their own [*z*].

[*w*] See BARBEYRAC's Preface to his French tranſlation of PUFENDORFF's *Syſtem of the Law of Nature and Nations*, § vi. p. 21. of the laſt edition.

[*x*] The corrupt manners of thoſe who lay in the darkneſs of idolatry are deſcribed, in an ample and affecting manner, in the firſt of CYPRIAN's epiſtles. See alſo on this ſubject CORNEL. ADAMI *Exercitatio de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus*. This is the fifth diſcourſe of a collection publiſhed by that learned writer at *Groningen*, 1712, in Quarto.

[*y*] See DIONYSIUS HALICARN. *Antiquit. Rom.* lib. vii. cap. lxxii. p. 460. tom. i. Edit. Hudſon.

[*z*] See PETIT *ad leges Atticas*, lib. i. tit. i. p. 71.

The Romans introduced their own rites among thoſe of the conquered nations.

XVII. In the provinces ſubjected to the Roman government, there aroſe a new kind of religion, formed by a mixture of the antient rites of the conquered nations with thoſe of the Romans. Theſe nations, who, before their ſubjection, had their own gods, and their own particular religious inſtitutions, were perſuaded, by degrees, to admit into their worſhip a great number of the ſacred rites and cuſtoms of their conquerors. The view of the Romans, in this change, was not only to confirm their authority by the powerful aid of religion, but alſo to aboliſh the inhuman rites which were performed by many of the barbarous nations who had received their yoke; and this change was effected partly by the prudence of the victors, partly by levity of the vanquiſhed, and by their ambition to pleaſe their new maſters.

Syſtems of religion different from that of the Romans.

XVIII. When, from the ſacred rites of the antient Romans, we paſs to a review of the other religions that prevailed in the world, we ſhall find that the moſt remarkable may be properly divided into two claſſes, of which the one will comprehend thoſe religious ſyſtems which owe their exiſtence to *political* views; and the other, thoſe which ſeem to have been formed for *military* purpoſes. In the former claſs may be ranked the religions of moſt of the eaſtern nations, eſpecially of the Perſians, Egyptians, and Indians, which appear to have been ſolely calculated for the preſervation of the ſtate; the ſupporting of the royal authority and grandeur; the maintenance of public peace; and the advancement of civil virtues. Under the *military* claſs may be comprehended the religious ſyſtem of the northern nations; ſince all the traditions that we find among the Germans, the Bretons, the Celts, and the Goths, concerning their divinities, have a manifeſt tendency to excite and nouriſh fortitude and ferocity, an inſenſibility of danger, and a contempt of life. An attentive inquiry into the religions of theſe reſpective nations will abundantly verify what is here aſſerted.

The wiſer among the heathens could not remedy theſe evils.

XIX. None of theſe nations, indeed, ever arrived to ſuch an exceſs of univerſal barbarity and ignorance, as not to have ſome diſcerning men among them, who were ſenſible of the extravagance of all theſe religions. But of theſe ſagacious obſervers, ſome were deſtitute of the weight and authority, that were neceſſary to remedy theſe over-grown evils; and others wanted the will to exert themſelves in ſuch a glorious cauſe. And, the truth is, none of them had wiſdom equal to ſuch a ſolemn and arduous enterprize. This appears manifeſtly from the laborious, but uſeleſs efforts of ſome of the Greek and Roman philoſophers againſt the vulgar ſuperſtitions. Theſe venerable ſages delivered, in their writings, many ſublime things concerning the nature of God, and the duties incumbent upon men; they diſputed with ſagacity againſt the popular religion; but to all this they added ſuch chimerical notions, and ſuch abſurd ſubtilties of their own, as may ſerve to convince us, that it belongs to God alone, and not to man, to reveal the truth without any mixture of impurity or error.

Two kinds of philoſophy prevailed at the time of CHRIST's birth.

XX. About the time of CHRIST's appearance upon earth, there were two kinds of philoſophy which prevailed among the civilized nations. One was the philoſophy of the Greeks, adopted alſo by the Romans; and the other, that of the Orientals, which had a great number of votaries in *Perſia*, *Syria*, *Chaldæa*, *Egypt*, and even among the Jews. The former was diſtinguiſhed by the ſimple title of *philoſophy*. The latter was honoured with the more pompous appellation of *ſcience*, or *knowledge* [a]; ſince thoſe who embraced this latter ſect pretended to be the reſtorers of the knowledge of God, which was loſt in the world [b]. The followers of both theſe ſyſtems, in conſequence of vehement diſputes and diſſenſions about ſeveral points, ſubdivided themſelves into a variety of ſects. It is, however, to be obſerved, that all the ſects of the oriental philoſophy deduced their various tenets from one fundamental principle, which they held in common; whereas the Greeks were much divided even about the firſt principles of ſcience.

As we ſhall have occaſion hereafter to ſpeak of the oriental philoſophy, we ſhall confine ourſelves here to the doctrines taught by the Grecian ſages, and ſhall give ſome account of the various ſects into which they were divided.

Some of the Grecian ſyſtems ſubverſive of all piety.

XXI. Among the Grecian ſects there were ſome which declared openly againſt all religion; and others, who, though they acknowledged a deity and admitted a religion, yet caſt a cloud over the truth, inſtead of exhibiting it in its genuine beauty and luſtre.

Of the former kind were the Epicureans and Academics. The Epicureans maintained, "That the world aroſe from chance; that the gods (whoſe exiſtence "they did not dare to deny) neither did, nor could extend their providential "care to human affairs; that the ſoul was mortal; that *pleaſure* [c] was to be "regarded as the ultimate end of man; and that *virtue* was neither worthy "of eſteem nor choice, but with a view to its attainment." The Academics aſſerted the impoſſibility of arriving at truth, and held it uncertain, "Whe"ther the gods exiſted or not; whether the ſoul was mortal or immortal; "whether virtue were preferable to vice, or vice to virtue." Theſe two ſects, though they ſtruck at the foundations of all religion, were the moſt numerous of all others at the birth of CHRIST, and were particularly encouraged by the liberality of the rich, and the protection of thoſe in power [d].

[(a) Γνῶσις (*gnoſis*) in the Greek ſignifies *ſcience*, or *knowledge*, and from hence came the title of Gnoſtics, which this preſumptuous ſect claimed as due to their ſuperior light and penetration in divine *things*.]

[b] St. PAUL mentions and condemns both theſe kinds of philoſophy; the Greek, in the *Epiſtle to the Coloſſians*, xi. 8. and Oriental, or Gnoſis, in the *Firſt Epiſtle to Timothy*, vi. 20.

[(c) The ambiguity of the word *pleaſure* has produced many diſputes in the explication of the Epicurean ſyſtem. If by *pleaſure*, be underſtood only *ſenſual* gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indiſputably monſtrous. But if it be taken in a larger ſenſe, and extended to intellectual and moral objects; in what does the ſcheme of Epicurus, with reſpect to virtue, differ from the opinions of thoſe Chriſtian philoſophers, who maintain that ſelf-love is the *only* ſpring of all human affections and actions?]

[d] That of the Epicureans was, however, the moſt numerous of the two, as appears from the teſtimony of CICERO, *De finibus*, &c. lib. i. cap. vii. lib. ii. cap. xiv. *Diſput. Tuſculan.* lib. v. cap. x. Hence the complaint, which JUVENAL makes in his XIIIth Satire, of the Atheiſm that prevailed at *Rome*, in thoſe excellent words:

> "Sunt in fortunæ qui caſibus omnia ponunt,
> "Et nullo credunt mundum rectore moveri,
> "Natura volvente vices et lucis et anni,
> "Atque ideo intrepidi quæcumque altaria tangunt.

Others corrupted the truth.

The Ariſtotelians.

XXII. We obſerved in the preceding ſection, that there was another kind of philoſophy, in which religion was admitted, but which was, at the ſame time, deficient by the obſcurity it caſt upon truth. Under the philoſophers of this claſs, may be reckoned the Platoniſts, the Stoics, and the followers of ARISTOTLE, whoſe ſubtle diſputations concerning God, religion, and the ſocial duties, were of little ſolid uſe to mankind. The nature of God, as it is explained by ARISTOTLE, is ſomething like the principle that gives motion to a machine; it is a nature happy in the contemplation of itſelf, and entirely regardleſs of human affairs; and ſuch a divinity, who differs but little from the god of Epicurus, cannot reaſonably be the object either of love or fear. With reſpect to the doctrine of this philoſopher concerning the human ſoul, it is uncertain, to ſay no more, whether he believed its immortality or not [*e*]. What then could be expected from ſuch a philoſophy? Could any thing ſolid and ſatisfactory, in favour of piety and virtue, be hoped for from a ſyſtem which excluded from the univerſe a divine providence, and inſinuated the mortality of the human ſoul?

The Stoics.

XXIII. The god of the Stoics has ſomewhat more majeſty, than the divinity of ARISTOTLE; nor is he repreſented by thoſe philoſophers as ſitting above the ſtarry heavens in a ſupine indolence, and a perfect inattention to the affairs of the univerſe. Yet he is deſcribed as a corporeal being, united to matter by a neceſſary connexion, and ſubject to the determinations of an immutable *fate*, ſo that neither rewards nor puniſhments can properly proceed from him [*f*]. The learned alſo know that, in the philoſophy of this ſect, the exiſtence of the ſoul was confined to a certain period of time. Now it is manifeſt, that theſe tenets remove, at once, the ſtrongeſt motives to virtue, and the moſt powerful reſtraints upon vice; and, therefore, the ſtoical ſyſtem may be conſidered as a body of ſpecious and pompous doctrine, but, at the ſame time, as a body without nerves, or any principles of conſiſtence and vigour.

The Platonics.

XXIV. PLATO is generally looked upon as ſuperior to all the other philoſophers in wiſdom; and this eminent rank does not ſeem to have been undeſervedly conferred upon him. He taught that the univerſe was governed by a being, glorious in power and wiſdom, and poſſeſſed of a perfect liberty and independence. He extended alſo the views of mortals beyond the grave, and ſhewed them, in futurity, proſpects adapted to excite their hopes, and to

---

[(*e*) See the notes upon CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe*, which Dr. MOSHEIM ſubjoined to his Latin tranſlation of that learned work, vol. i. p. 66. 500. vol. ii. p. 1171. See alſo upon the ſame ſubject MOURGUE's *Plan Theologique du Pythagoriſm*, tom. i. p. 79.]

[(*f*) Thus is the ſtoical doctrine of *fate* generally repreſented; but not more generally, than unjuſtly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, ſeems to have ſignified no more, in the intention of the wiſeſt of that ſect, than the plan of government formed originally in the divine mind, a plan all wiſe and perfect; and from which, of conſequence, the ſupreme being, morally ſpeaking, can never depart. So that when Jupiter is ſaid by the Stoics to be ſubject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is ſubject to the wiſdom of his own counſels, and acts ever in conformity with his ſupreme perfections. The following remarkable paſſage of SENECA, drawn from the vth chapter of his book *De providentia*, is ſufficient to confirm the explication we have here given of the *ſtoical fate*. "Ille ipſe omnium conditor et "rector SCRIPSIT quidem FATA, ſed ſequitur. Semper PARET, ſemel JUSSIT."]

work upon their fears. His doctrine, however, beſides the weakneſs of the foundations on which it reſts, and the obſcurity with which it is often expreſſed, has likewiſe many other conſiderable defects. It repreſents the ſupreme creator of the world as deſtitute of many virtues [*g*], and confined to a certain determinate portion of ſpace. Its deciſions, with reſpect to the ſoul, and dæmons, are too much adapted to beget and nouriſh ſuperſtition. Nor will the moral philoſophy of PLATO appear worthy of ſuch an high degree of admiration, if we attentively examine and compare together its various parts, and reduce them to their principles [*h*].

Eclectics.

XXV. As then in theſe different ſects, there were many things maintained that were highly unreaſonable and abſurd; and as a contentious ſpirit of oppoſition and diſpute prevailed among them all; certain men of true diſcernment and of moderate characters were of opinion, that none of theſe ſects were to be adhered to in all matters, but that it was rather wiſe to chuſe and extract out of each of them ſuch tenets and doctrines as were good and reaſonable, and to abandon and reject the reſt. This gave riſe to a new form of philoſophy in *Egypt*, and principally at *Alexandria*, which was called the *Eclectic*, whoſe founder, according to ſome, was POTAMON, an Alexandrian, though this opinion is not without its difficulties. It appears manifeſtly from the teſtimony of PHILO the Jew, who was himſelf one of this ſect, that this philoſophy was in a flouriſhing ſtate at *Alexandria*, when our Saviour was upon the earth. The Eclectics held PLATO in the higheſt eſteem, though they made no ſcruple to join with his doctrines, whatever they thought conformable to reaſon in the tenets and opinions of the other philoſophers [*i*].

The uſe of the foregoing chapter.

XXVI. The attentive reader will eaſily obſerve the tendency of the ſhort view, that we have here given of the miſerable ſtate of the world at the birth of CHRIST, and will draw from it the concluſions to which it ſo naturally leads, *viz.* That mankind, in that period of darkneſs and corruption, ſtood highly in need of ſome divine teacher to convey to the mind *true and certain principles* of religion and wiſdom, and to recal wandering mortals to the ſublime paths of piety and virtue. The conſideration of this wretched condition of mankind will be alſo ſingularly uſeful to thoſe who are not ſufficiently acquainted with the advantages, the comforts, and the ſupport, which the ſublime doctrines of Chriſtianity are ſo proper to adminiſter in every ſtate, relation, and circumſtance of life. A ſet of miſerable and unthinking creatures treat with negligence, nay, ſometimes with contempt, the religion of

---

[(*g*) This accuſation of him ſeems to be carried too far by Dr. MOSHEIM. It is not ſtrictly true, that the doctrine of PLATO repreſents the ſupreme being as deſtitute of *many* virtues. On the contrary, *all* the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that philoſopher. What probably gave occaſion to this animadverſion of our learned author, was the erroneous notion of PLATO, concerning the *invincible malignity* and corruption of *matter*, which the divine power had not been ſufficient to reduce entirely to order. Though this notion is, indeed, injurious to the omnipotence of God, yet it is not ſufficient to juſtify the cenſure now under conſideration.]

[*h*] There is an ample account of the defects of the Platonic philoſophy in a work entitled, *Defenſe des Peres accuſés de Platoniſm*, par FRANC. BALTUS; but there is more learning than accuracy in that performance.

[*i*] See GODOF. OLEARIUS, *De philoſophia Eclectica*, JAC. BRUCKER, and others.

JESUS, not conſidering that they are indebted to it for all the good things which they ſo ungratefully enjoy.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the civil and religious STATE *of the* JEWISH NATION *at the birth of* CHRIST.

The Jews governed by Herod the Great.

I. THE ſtate of the Jews was not much better than that of the other nations at the time of CHRIST's appearance in the world. They were governed by HEROD, who was himſelf a tributary to the Roman people. This prince was ſurnamed the GREAT (ſurely from no other circumſtance than the greatneſs of his vices) and his government was a yoke of the moſt vexatious and oppreſſive kind. By a cruel, ſuſpicious, and over-bearing temper, he drew upon himſelf the averſion of all, not excepting thoſe who lived upon his bounty. By a mad luxury, and an affectation of magnificence far above his fortune, together with the moſt profuſe and immoderate largeſſes, he exhauſted the treaſures of that miſerable nation. Under his adminiſtration, and by his means, the Roman luxury was received in *Paleſtine*, accompanied with the worſt vices of that licentious people [*k*]. In a word, *Judæa*, governed by HEROD, groaned under all that corruption, which might be expected from the authority and the example of a prince, who, though a Jew in outward profeſſion, was, in point of morals and practice, a contemner of all laws human and divine.

The ſtate of *Judæa* after the death of Herod.

II. After the death of this tyrant, the Romans divided the government of *Paleſtine* between his ſons. In this diviſion the one half of *Judæa* was given to ARCHELAUS, with the title of Exarch; and the other was divided between his two brothers, ANTIPAS and PHILIP. ARCHELAUS was a corrupt and wicked prince, and followed the example of his father's crimes in ſuch a manner, that the Jews, grown weary of his iniquitous adminiſtration, laid their complaints and grievances before AUGUSTUS, who delivered them from their oppreſſor, by baniſhing him from his dominions about ten years after the death of HEROD the GREAT. The kingdom of this dethroned prince was reduced to the form of a province, and added to the juriſdiction of the governor of *Syria*, to the great detriment of the Jews, whoſe heavieſt calamities were owing to this change, and whoſe final deſtruction was its undoubted effect in the appointment of providence.

The calamities that fell upon the Jewiſh nation.

III. However ſevere the authority was, which the Romans exerciſed over the Jews, yet it did not extend to the entire ſuppreſſion of all their civil and religious privileges. The Jews were, in ſome meaſure, governed by their own laws, and they were permitted the enjoyment of the religion they had received from the glorious founder of their church and ſtate. The adminiſtration of religious ceremonies was committed, as before, to the high-prieſt, and to the ſanhedrim; to the former of whom the orders of the prieſts and levites were in the uſual ſubordination; and the form of outward worſhip, except in a very few points, had ſuffered no viſible change. But, on the other hand, it is impoſſible to expreſs the inquietude and diſguſt, the calamities and vexations, which this unhappy nation ſuffered from the preſence of the Romans, whom their religion obliged them to look upon as a polluted and idolatrous people, and, in a more particular manner, from the avarice and cruelty of the Prætors, and the frauds and extortions of the Publicans. So that, all things conſidered, their condition, who lived under the government of the other ſons of HEROD, was much more ſupportable than the ſtate of thoſe, who were immediately ſubject to the Roman juriſdiction.

[*k*] See on this ſubject, CHRIST. NOLDII *Hiſtoria Idumæa*, which is annexed to HAVERCAMP's edition of *Joſephus*, vol. ii. p. 333. See alſo BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, tom. i. part I. p. 27. NORIS, *Cenotaph. Piſan.* PRIDEUX, *Hiſtory of the Jews*; CELLARIUS, his *Hiſtoria Herodum*, in the firſt part of his Academical Diſſertations, p. 207; and above all, JOSEPHUS the Jewiſh Hiſtorian.

Theſe calamities encreaſed by the prieſts and rulers of the Jewiſh nation.

IV. It was not, however, from the Romans alone, that the calamities of this miſerable people proceeded. Their own rulers multiplied their vexations, and hindered them from enjoying any little comforts that were left to them by the Roman magiſtrates. The leaders of the people, and the chief prieſts, were, according to the account of JOSEPHUS, profligate wretches, who had purchaſed their places by bribes, or by acts of iniquity, and who maintained their ill-acquired authority by the moſt flagitious and abominable crimes. The ſubordinate and inferior members were infected with the corruption of the head; the prieſts, and thoſe, who poſſeſſed any ſhadow of authority, were become diſſolute and abandoned to the higheſt degree; while the multitude, ſet on by theſe corrupt examples, ran head-long into every ſort of iniquity, and by their endleſs ſeditions, robberies, and extortions, armed againſt them, both the juſtice of God, and the vengeance of men.

The Jewiſh religion much corrupted among the multitude.

V. Two religions flouriſhed at this time in *Paleſtine*, *viz.* the Jewiſh and the Samaritan, whoſe reſpective followers beheld thoſe of the oppoſite ſect with the utmoſt averſion. The Jewiſh religion ſtands expoſed to our view in the books of the Old Teſtament; but at the time of CHRIST's appearance, it had loſt much of its original nature, and of its primitive aſpect. Errors of a very pernicious kind had infected the whole body of the people, and the more learned part of the nation were divided upon points of the higheſt conſequence. All looked for a deliverer, but not for ſuch a one as God had promiſed. Inſtead of a meek and ſpiritual Saviour, they expected a formidable and warlike prince, to break off their chains, and ſet them at liberty from the Roman yoke. All regarded the whole of religion, as conſiſting in the rites appointed by MOSES, and in the performance of ſome external acts of duty towards the Gentiles. They were all horribly unanimous in excluding from the hopes of eternal life all the other nations of the world; and, as a conſequence of this odious ſyſtem, they treated them with the utmoſt rigour and inhumanity, when any occaſion was offered them. And beſides theſe corrupt and vicious principles, there prevailed among them ſeveral abſurd and ſuperſtitious notions concerning the divine nature, inviſible powers, magic, *&c.* which they had partly brought with them from the Babylonian captivity, and partly derived from the Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians, who lived in their neighbourhood.

VI. Re-

And alſo among the doctors, who were divided into various ſects.

VI. Religion had not a better fate among the learned, than among the multitude. The ſupercilious doctors, who vaunted their profound knowledge of the law, and their deep ſcience in ſpiritual and divine things, were conſtantly ſhewing their fallibility and their ignorance by their religious differences, and were divided into a great variety of ſects. Of theſe ſects three have, in a manner, eclipſed the reſt both by the number of their adherents, and alſo by the weight and authority which they acquired. Theſe were the Phariſees, the Sadducees, and the Eſſenes [*l*]. There is frequent mention made of the two former in the ſacred writings; but the knowledge of the rites and doctrines of the latter, is to be derived from JOSEPHUS, PHILO, and other hiſtorians. Theſe three illuſtrious ſects were agreed in the fundamental principles of the Jewiſh religion, while, at the ſame time, they were involved in endleſs diſputes upon points of the higheſt importance, and about matters in which the ſalvation of mankind was directly concerned; and their controverſies could not but be highly detrimental to the rude and illiterate multitude, as every one muſt eaſily perceive.

The three famous Jewiſh ſects divided upon various points.

VII. It may not be improper to mention here ſome of the principal matters that were debated among theſe famous ſects. One of the main points of controverſy was: *Whether the* WRITTEN LAW *alone, was of divine authority.* The Phariſees added to this *law* another, which had been received by oral tradition. This the Sadducees and Eſſenes rejected as of no authority, and adhered to the *written law* as the only divine rule of obedience. They differed alſo in their opinions concerning the true *ſenſe of the law.* For, while the Phariſees attributed to the ſacred text a double ſenſe, one of which was obvious, regarding only the *words*, and another myſterious, relating to the intimate nature of the *things* expreſſed; and while the Sadducees maintained that nothing further was delivered by the law, than that which was contained in the ſignification of the words; the Eſſenes, at leaſt the greateſt part of that ſect, entertained an opinion different from both of theſe. They aſſerted, in their jargon, that the words of the law were abſolutely void of all power, and that the things expreſſed by them, were the images of holy and celeſtial objects. Theſe litigious ſubtilties, and unintelligible wranglings, about the nature and ſenſe of the divine word, were ſucceeded by a controverſy of the greateſt moment, concerning the rewards and puniſhments of the law, particularly with reſpect to their extent. The Phariſees were of opinion, that theſe rewards and puniſhments extended both to the ſoul and body, and that their duration was prolonged beyond the limits of this tranſitory ſtate. The Sadducees aſſigned to them the ſame period that concludes this mortal life. The Eſſenes differed from both; and maintained that future rewards and puniſhments extended to the ſoul alone, and not to the body, which they conſidered as a maſs of malignant matter, and as the priſon of the immortal ſpirit.

[*l*] Beſides theſe more illuſtrious ſects, there were ſeveral of inferior note, which prevailed among the Jews at the time of CHRIST's appearance. The Herodians are mentioned by the ſacred writers, the Gaulonites by JOSEPHUS, and others by EPIPHANIUS and HEGESIPPUS in EUSEBIUS; nor is it rational to look upon theſe ſects as fictitious.

But exerciſed reciprocal toleration towards each other.

VIII. Theſe differences, in matters of ſuch vaſt conſequence, between the three famous ſects abovementioned, produced none of thoſe injurious and malignant effects, which are too often ſeen to ariſe from religious controverſies. But ſuch, as have any acquaintance with the hiſtory of theſe times, will not be ſo far deceived by this ſpecious appearance of moderation, as to attribute it to noble or generous principles. They will look through the fair outſide, and ſee that their mutual fears of each other were the latent reaſon of this apparent charity and mutual forbearance. The Sadducees enjoyed the favour and protection of the great. The Phariſees, on the other hand, were extremely high in the eſteem of the multitude. And hence they were both ſecured againſt the attempts of each other, and lived in peace, notwithſtanding the diverſity of their religious ſentiments. The government of the Romans contributed alſo to the maintenance of this mutual toleration and tranquillity, as they were ever ready to ſuppreſs and puniſh whatever had the appearance of tumult and ſedition. We may add to all this, that the Sadducean principles rendered that ſect naturally averſe to all ſorts of altercation and tumult. Libertiniſm has for its objects eaſe and pleaſure, and chuſes rather to ſlumber in the arms of a fallacious ſecurity, than to expoſe itſelf to the painful activity, which is required both in the ſearch and in the defence of truth.

Eſſenes.

IX. The Eſſenes had little occaſion to quarrel with the other ſects, as they dwelt generally in a rural ſolitude, far removed from the view and commerce of men. This ſingular ſect, which was ſpred abroad through *Syria*, *Egypt*, and the neighbouring countries, maintained, that religion conſiſted wholly in contemplation and ſilence. By a rigorous abſtinence alſo, and a variety of penitential exerciſes and mortifications, which they ſeem to have borrowed from the Egyptians [*m*], they endeavoured to arrive at ſtill higher degrees of perfection in virtue. There prevailed, however, among the members of this ſect, a conſiderable difference both in point of opinion and diſcipline. Some paſſed their lives in a ſtate of celibacy, and employed their time in educating and inſtructing the children of others. Others embraced the ſtate of matrimony, which they conſidered as lawful, when entered into with the ſole deſign of propagating the ſpecies, and not to ſatisfy the demands of luſt. Thoſe of the Eſſenes who dwelt in *Syria*, held the poſſibility of appeaſing the deity by ſacrifices, though, in a manner, quite different from that of the Jews; by which, however, it appears that they had not utterly rejected the literal ſenſe of the Moſaic law. But thoſe who wandered in the deſarts of *Egypt* were of very different ſentiments: they maintained, that no offering was acceptable to God but that of a ſerene and compoſed mind, addicted to the contemplation of divine things; and it is manifeſt from hence, that they looked upon the law of Moſes as an allegorical ſyſtem of ſpiritual and myſterious truths, and renounced in its explication all regard to the outward letter [*n*].

[*m*] See the annotations of Holſtenius to Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras, p. 11. of the edition publiſhed by Kuſter.

[*n*] See MOSHEIM's obſervations on a ſmall treatiſe of the learned CUDWORTH's, concerning the true notion of the Lord's ſupper, p. 4.

The Therapeutæ.

X. The Therapeutæ, of whom PHILO the Jew makes particular mention in his treatiſe concerning *Contemplative Life*, are ſuppoſed to have been a branch of this ſect. From this notion aroſe the diviſion of the Eſſenes into *theoretical* and *practical*. The former of theſe were wholly devoted to contemplation, and are the ſame with the Therapeutæ; while the latter employed a part of their time in the performance of the duties of active life. Whether this diviſion be accurate or not, is a matter which I will not take upon me to determine. Be that as it will, I ſee nothing in the laws or manners of the Therapeutæ, that ſhould lead us to conſider them as a branch of the Eſſenes, nor indeed has PHILO aſſerted any ſuch thing. There may have been, ſurely, many other fanatical tribes among the Jews, beſides that of the Eſſenes; nor ſhould a reſemblance of principles always induce us to make a coalition of ſects. It is, however, certain, that the Therapeutæ were neither Chriſtians, nor Egyptians, as ſome have erroneouſly imagined. They were undoubtedly Jews; nay, they gloried in that title, and ſtyled themſelves, with particular affectation, the true diſciples of MOSES, though their manner of life was equally repugnant to the inſtitutions of that great law-giver, and to the dictates of right reaſon, and ſhewed them to be a tribe of melancholy and wrong-headed Enthuſiaſts [o].

The moral doctrine of theſe ſects.

XI. None of theſe ſects, indeed, ſeemed to have the intereſts of real and true piety at heart; nor were their principles and diſcipline at all adapted to the advancement of pure and ſubſtantial virtue. The Phariſees courted popular applauſe by a vain oſtentation of pretended ſanctity, and an auſtere method of living, while, in reality, they were ſtrangers to true holineſs, and were inwardly defiled with the moſt criminal diſpoſitions, with which our Saviour frequently reproaches them. They alſo treated with more veneration the commandments and traditions of men, than the ſacred precepts and laws of God [p]. The Sadducees, by denying a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, removed, at once, the moſt powerful incentives to virtue, and the moſt effectual reſtraints upon vice, and thus gave new vigour to every ſinful paſſion, and a full encouragement to the indulgence of every irregular deſire. As to the Eſſenes, they were a fanatical and ſuperſtitious tribe, who placed religion in a certain ſort of ſeraphic indolence, and, looking upon piety to God as incompatible with any ſocial attachment to men, diſſolved, by this pernicious doctrine, all the great bonds of human ſociety.

The multitude ſunk in ſuperſtition, and corruption.

XII. While then ſuch darkneſs, ſuch errors and diſſenſions prevailed among thoſe, who aſſumed the character and authority of perſons diſtinguiſhed by their ſuperior ſanctity and wiſdom, it will not be difficult to imagine, how totally corrupt the religion and morals of the multitude muſt have been. They were, accordingly, ſunk in the moſt deplorable ignorance of God, and of divine things; and had no notion of any other way of rendering themſelves acceptable to the ſupreme being, than by ſacrifices, waſhings, and the other external rites and ceremonies of the Moſaic law. Hence proceeded that diſſolution of manners, and that profligate wickedneſs, which prevailed among the Jews, during Christ's miniſtry upon earth. And hence the divine Saviour compares that people to a flock of ſheep, which wandered without a ſhepherd; and their doctors to men, who, though deprived themſelves of ſight, yet pretended to ſhew the way to others [q].

---

[o] The principal writers, who have given accounts of the Therapeutæ, are mentioned by JO. ALBERT FABRICIUS in ivth chapter of his *Lux Salutaris Evangelii toto orbe exoriens*, p. 55.

[p] Matt. xxiii. 13, 14, &c.

The Cabbala, a ſource of many errors among the Jews.

XIII. To all theſe corruptions, both in point of doctrine and practice, which reigned among the Jews at the time of Christ's coming, we may add the attachment which many of them diſcovered to the tenets of the oriental philoſophy concerning the origin of the world, and to the doctrine of the Cabbala, which was undoubtedly derived from thence. That conſiderable numbers of the Jews had imbibed the errors of this fantaſtic ſyſtem appears evidently, both from the books of the New Teſtament, and from the ancient hiſtory of the Chriſtian Church [r]; and it is alſo certain, that many of the Gnoſtic ſects were founded by Jews. Thoſe of that degenerate people, who adopted this chimerical philoſophy, muſt have differed vaſtly from the reſt in their opinions concerning the God of the Old Teſtament, the origin of the world, the character and doctrine of Moses, and the nature and miniſtry of the Messiah; ſince they maintained, that the creator of this world was a being different from the ſupreme God, and that his dominion over the human race was to be deſtroyed by the Messiah. Every one muſt ſee that this enormous ſyſtem was fruitful of errors, deſtructive of the very foundations of judaiſm.

The external worſhip of God corrupted alſo by vain rites and human inventions.

XIV. If any part of the Jewiſh religion was leſs deformed and corrupted than the reſt, it was, certainly, the form of external worſhip, which was eſtabliſhed by the law of Moses. And yet many learned men have obſerved, that a great variety of rites were introduced into the ſervice of the temple, of which no traces are to be found in the ſacred writings. The inſtitution of theſe additional ceremonies was manifeſtly owing to thoſe changes and revolutions, which rendered the Jews more converſant with the nations round about them, than they had formerly been. For when they ſaw the ſacred rites of the Greeks and Romans, they were taken with ſeveral of the ceremonies that were uſed in the worſhip of the heathen deities, and did not heſitate to adopt them in the ſervice of the true God, and add them as an ornament to the rites which they had received by divine appointment [s].

The cauſes of the corruption, in point of doctrine and morals, that reigned among the Jews.

XV. But whence ſuch enormous degrees of corruption in that very nation which God had, in a peculiar manner, ſeparated from an idolatrous world to be the depoſitory of divine truth? Various cauſes may be aſſigned, in order to give a ſatisfactory account of this matter. *Firſt*, It is certain, that the anceſtors of thoſe Jews, who lived in the time of our Saviour, had brought from *Chaldæa*, and the neighbouring countries, many extravagant and idle fancies, which were utterly unknown to the original founders of the nation [t]. The conqueſt of *Aſia*, by ALEXANDER the GREAT, was, alſo, an event from which we may date a new acceſſion of errors to the Jewiſh ſyſtem; ſince, in conſequence of that revolution, the manners and opinions of the Greeks began to ſpred themſelves among the Perſians, Syrians, Arabians, and likewiſe among the Jews, who, before that period, were entirely unacquainted with letters and philoſophy. We may, further, rank among the cauſes, that contributed to corrupt the religion and manners of the Jews, their voyages into the adjacent countries, eſpecially *Egypt* and *Phœnicia*, in purſuit of wealth. For, with the treaſures of theſe corrupt and ſuperſtitious nations, they brought home alſo their pernicious errors, and their idle fictions, which were imperceptibly blended with their religious ſyſtem. Nor ought we to omit, in this enumeration, the peſtilential influence of the wicked reigns of HEROD and his ſons, and the enormous inſtances of idolatry, error, and licentiouſneſs, which this unhappy people had conſtantly before their eyes in the religion and manners of the Roman governors and ſoldiers, which, no doubt, contributed much to the progreſs of their national ſuperſtition, and corruption of manners. We might add here many more facts and circumſtances, to illuſtrate further the matter under conſideration; but theſe will be readily ſuggeſted to ſuch as have the leaſt acquaintance with the Jewiſh hiſtory from the time of the Maccabees.

---

[q] Matt. x. 6. xv. 24, 25. John ix. 39.

[r] See Joh. Chr. Wolf *Biblioth. Ebraica*, vol. ii. lib. vii. cap. i. § ix. p. 206.

[s] See the learned work of Spencer, *De legibus Hebræorum*, in the iv^th^ book, of which he treats expreſly of thoſe Hebrew rites which were borrowed from the Gentile worſhip, vol. ii. p. 1089, edition of *Cambridge*.

Amidſt this general corruption, ſome remains of piety were to be found.

XVI. It is indeed worthy of obſervation, that, corrupted as the Jews were with the errors and ſuperſtitions of the neighbouring nations, they ſtill preſerved a zealous attachment to the law of MOSES, and were extremely careful that it ſhould not ſuffer any diminution of its credit, or loſe any, the leaſt degree of that veneration, that was due to its divine authority. Hence *ſynagogues* were erected throughout the province of *Judæa*, in which the people aſſembled for the purpoſes of divine worſhip, and to hear their doctors interpret and explain the holy ſcriptures. There were, beſides, in the more populous towns, public ſchools, in which learned men were appointed to inſtruct the youth in the knowledge of divine things, and alſo in other branches of ſcience [u]. And it is beyond all doubt, that theſe inſtitutions contributed to maintain the law in its primitive authority, and to ſtem the torrent of abounding iniquity.

The Samaritans.

XVII. The Samaritans, who celebrated divine worſhip in the temple that was built on mount *Garizim*, lay under the burthen of the ſame evils that oppreſſed the Jews, with whom they lived in the bittereſt enmity, and were alſo, like them, highly inſtrumental in increaſing their own calamities. We learn from the moſt authentic hiſtories of theſe times, that the Samaritans ſuffered as much as the Jews, from troubles and diviſions fomented by the intrigues of factious ſpirits, though their religious ſects were yet leſs numerous than thoſe of the latter. Their religion, alſo, was much more corrupted than that of the Jews, as CHRIST himſelf declares in his converſation with the woman of *Samaria*; though it appears, at the ſame time, that their notions concerning the offices and miniſtry of the MESSIAH, were much more juſt and conformable to truth, than thoſe which were entertained at *Jeruſalem* [*w*]. Upon the whole it is certain, that the Samaritans mixed the profane errors of the Gentiles with the ſacred doctrines of the Jews, and were exceſſively corrupted by the idolatrous cuſtoms of the Pagan nations [*x*].

---

[t] See GALE's obſervations on Jamblichus, *De myſteriis Ægyptiorum*, p. 206. JOSEPHUS acknowledges the ſame thing in his *Jewiſh Antiquities*, book iii. ch. vii. § 2.

[u] See CAMP. VITRINGA, *De ſynagoga vetere*, lib. iii. cap. v. p. 667. and lib. i. cap. v. p. 133. vii. p. 156.

The ſtate of the Jews out of *Paleſtine*.

XVIII. The Jews multiplied ſo prodigiouſly, that the narrow bounds of *Paleſtine* were no longer ſufficient to contain them. They poured, therefore, their increaſing numbers into the neighbouring countries, and that with ſuch rapidity, that, at the time of CHRIST's birth, there was ſcarcely a province in the empire, where they were not found carrying on commerce, and exerciſing other lucrative arts. They were maintained, in foreign countries, againſt injurious treatment and violence by the ſpecial edicts and protection of the magiſtrates [*y*]; and this, indeed, was abſolutely neceſſary, ſince, in moſt places, the remarkable difference of their religion and manners from thoſe of the other nations, expoſed them to the hatred and indignation of the ignorant and bigotted multitude. All this appears to have been moſt ſingularly and wiſely directed by the adorable hand of an interpoſing providence, to the end, that the people, which was the ſole depoſitary of the true religion, and of the knowledge of one ſupreme God, being ſpred abroad through the whole earth, might be every where, by their example, a reproach to ſuperſtition, contribute in ſome meaſure to check it, and thus prepare the way for that yet fuller diſcovery of divine truth, which was to ſhine upon the world from the miniſtry and goſpel of the ſon of God.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the life and actions of JESUS CHRIST.

The birth of CHRIST.

I. THE errors and diſorders, that we have now been contemplating, required ſomething far above human wiſdom and power to diſpel and remove them, and to deliver mankind from the miſerable ſtate to which they

---

[(*w*) CHRIST inſinuates, on the contrary, in the ſtrongeſt manner, the ſuperiority of the Jewiſh worſhip to that of the Samaritans, John iv. 22. See alſo, on this head, 2 Kings xvii. 29. The paſſage to which Dr. MOSHEIM refers, as a proof that the Samaritans had juſter notions of the MESSIAH than the Jews, is the 25 verſe of the chapter of St. John, already cited, where the woman of Samaria ſays to JESUS, *I know that* MESSIAH *cometh which is called* CHRIST: *when he is come, he will tell us all things.* But this paſſage ſeems much too vague to juſtify the concluſion of our learned hiſtorian. Beſides, the confeſſion of one perſon, who may poſſibly have had ſome ſingular and extraordinary advantages, is not a proof, that the nation in general entertained the ſame ſentiments, eſpecially ſince we know that the Samaritans had corrupted the ſervice of God by a profane mixture of the groſſeſt idolatries.]

[*x*] Thoſe who deſire an exact account of the principal authors that have written concerning the Samaritans, will find it in the learned work of JO. GOTTLOB CARPZOVIUS, entitled, *Criticæ S. Vet. Teſtam.* part II. cap. iv. p. 595.

[*y*] See the account, publiſhed at *Leyden* 1712, by JAMES GRONOVIUS, of the Roman and

were reduced by them. Therefore, towards the concluſion of the reign of HEROD the GREAT, the ſon of God deſcended upon earth, and, taking upon him the human nature, appeared to men under the ſublime characters of an infallible teacher, an all ſufficient mediator, and a ſpiritual and immortal king. The place of his birth was *Bethlehem*, in the land of *Paleſtine*. The year, in which it happened, has not hitherto been fixed with certainty, notwithſtanding the deep and laborious reſearches of the learned on that matter. There is nothing ſurprizing in this, when we conſider that the firſt Chriſtians laboured under the ſame difficulties, and were divided in their opinions, concerning the time of CHRIST's birth [z]. That which appears moſt probable, is, that it happened about a year and ſix months before the death of HEROD, in the year of Rome 748, or 749 [a]. The uncertainty, however, of this point is of no ſort of conſequence. We know that the SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS has ſhone upon the world. And, though we cannot fix the preciſe period in which he aroſe, this will not hinder us from enjoying the direction and influence of his vital and ſalutary beams.

The accounts given of CHRIST during his infancy and youth.

II. Four inſpired writers, who have tranſmitted to us an account of the life and actions of JESUS CHRIST, mention particularly his birth, his lineage, his family, and his parents; but they ſay very little concerning his infancy and his earlier youth. Not long after his birth, he was conducted by his parents into *Egypt*, that he might be there out of the reach of HEROD's cruelty [b]. When he was but twelve years old he diſputed, in the temple, with the moſt learned of the Jewiſh doctors, concerning the ſublime truths of religion. And the reſt of his life, until the thirtieth year of his age, was ſpent in the obſcurity of a private condition, and conſecrated to the duties of filial obedience [c]. This is all that the wiſdom of God has permitted us to know, with certainty, of CHRIST, before he entered upon his public miniſtry, nor is the ſtory of his having followed the trade of his adopted father JOSEPH built upon any ſure foundation. There have been, indeed, ſeveral writers, who either through the levity of a wanton imagination, or with a deſign to attract the admiration of the multitude, have invented a ſeries of the moſt extravagant and ridiculous fables, in order to give an account of this obſcure part of the Saviour's life [d].

John, the forerunner of the Meſſiah.

III. JESUS began his public miniſtry in the thirtieth year of his age, and to render it more ſolemn and affecting to the Jews, a man, whoſe name was JOHN, the ſon of a Jewiſh prieſt, a perſon of great gravity alſo, and much reſpected on account of the auſtere dignity of his life and manners, was commanded by God to proclaim to the people the coming of the MESSIAH, that

---

Aſiatic edicts in favour of the Jews, allowing them the free and ſecure exerciſe of their religion, throughout all the cities of the *Leſſer Aſia*.

[z] The learned JOHN ALBERT FABRICIUS has collected all the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of CHRIST's birth, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. vii. § ix. p. 187.

[a] Matt. iii. 2, &c. John i. 22, &c.

[b] Matt. ii. 13.

[c] Luke ii. 51, 52.

[d] See the account, which the abovementioned ALBERT FABRICIUS has given of theſe romantic triflers, in his *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* tom. i.

had been promiſed to their fathers. This extraordinary man called himſelf the fore-runner of the Messiah. Filled with a holy zeal and a divine fervour, he cried aloud to the Jewiſh nation to depart from their tranſgreſſions, and to purify their hearts, that they might thus partake of the bleſſings which the ſon of God was now come to offer to the world. The exhortations of this reſpectable meſſenger were not without effect, and thoſe, who, moved by his ſolemn admonitions had formed the reſolution of correcting their evil diſpoſitions and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the redeemer by the ceremony of immerſion, or baptiſm [e]. Christ himſelf, before he began his miniſtry, deſired to be ſolemnly baptized by John in the waters of *Jordan*, that he might not, in any point, neglect to anſwer the demands of the Jewiſh law.

The life of Christ.

IV. It is not neceſſary to enter here into a particular detail of the life and actions of Jesus Christ. All Chriſtains muſt be perfectly well acquainted with them. They muſt know, that, during the ſpace of three years, and amidſt the deepeſt trials of affliction, and diſtreſs, he inſtructed the Jewiſh nation in the will and counſels of the moſt high, and omitted nothing, in the courſe of his miniſtry, that could contribute either to gain the multitude, or to charm the wiſe. Every one knows, that his life was a continued ſcene of the moſt perfect ſanctity and the pureſt and moſt active virtue, not only without ſpot, but alſo beyond the reach of ſuſpicion. And it is alſo well known that by miracles of the moſt ſtupendous kind, and not more ſtupendous than ſalutary and beneficent, he diſplayed to the univerſe the truth of that religion, which he brought with him from above, and demonſtrated the reality of his divine commiſſion in the moſt illuſtrious manner.

The election of the apoſtles, and of the lxx diſciples.

V. As this divine religion was to be propagated to the utmoſt ends of the earth, it was neceſſary that Christ ſhould chuſe a certain number of perſons, to accompany him conſtantly through the whole courſe of his miniſtry; that thus they might be faithful and reſpectable witneſſes of the ſanctity of his life, and the grandeur of his miracles, to the remoteſt nations; and alſo tranſmit to the lateſt poſterity a genuine account of his ſublime doctrines, and of the nature and end of the goſpel-diſpenſation. Therefore Jesus choſe, out of the multitude that attended his diſcourſes, twelve perſons, whom he ſeparated from the reſt by the name of *Apoſtles*. Theſe men were illiterate, poor, and of mean extraction, and ſuch alone were truly proper to anſwer the views of the divine Saviour. He avoided making uſe of the miniſtry of perſons endowed with the advantages of fortune and birth, or enriched with the treaſures of eloquence and learning, leſt the fruits of this embaſſy, and the progreſs of the goſpel, ſhould be attributed to human and natural cauſes [f]. Theſe apoſtles were ſent but once to preach to the Jews during the life of Christ [g]. He choſe to keep them about his own perſon, that they might be thoroughly inſtructed in the affairs of his kingdom. That the multitude, however, might not be deſtitute of teachers to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth, Christ appointed lxx diſciples to preach the glad tidings of life eternal throughout the whole province of *Judæa* [h].

---

[e] Matt. iii. 6. John i. 22. [f] 1 Cor. i. 21. [g] Matt. x. 7. [h] Luke x. 1.

Why the number of the apoſtles was fixed to XII, and that of the diſciples to LXX.

VI. The reſearches of the learned have been employed to find out the reaſon of CHRIST's fixing the number of the apoſtles to *twelve*, and that of the diſciples to *ſeventy*; and various conjectures have been applied to the ſolution of this queſtion. But ſince it is manifeſt, from the words of our Saviour himſelf [*i*], that he intended the number of the XII apoſtles as an alluſion to that of the tribes of ISRAEL; it can ſcarcely be doubted, that he was willing to inſinuate by this appointment, that he was the ſupreme lord, and high-prieſt of theſe twelve tribes, into which the Jewiſh nation was divided. And as the number of diſciples anſwers evidently to that of the ſenators, of whom the council of the people, or the ſanhedrim, was compoſed, there is a high degree of probability in the conjecture of thoſe, who think, that CHRIST, by the choice of the *ſeventy*, deſigned to admoniſh the Jews, that the authority of their ſanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power, with reſpect to religious matters, was veſted in him alone.

CHRIST's fame extends beyond *Judæa*.

VII. The miniſtry of the divine Saviour was confined to the Jews, nor, while he remained upon earth, did he permit his apoſtles or diſciples to extend their labours beyond this diſtinguiſhed nation [*k*]. At the ſame time, if we conſider the illuſtrious acts of mercy and omnipotence, that were performed by CHRIST, it will be natural to conclude that his fame muſt have been very ſoon ſpred abroad in other countries. We learn from writers of no ſmall note, that ABGARUS king of *Edeſſa*, being ſeized with a ſevere and dangerous illneſs, wrote to our bleſſed Lord to implore his aſſiſtance; and that JESUS not only wrote him a gracious anſwer, but alſo accompanied it with his picture, as a mark of his eſteem for that pious prince [*l*]. Theſe letters are ſtill extant. But they are juſtly looked upon as fictitious by moſt writers, who alſo go yet further, and treat the whole ſtory of ABGARUS as entirely fabulous, and unworthy of credit [*m*]. I will not pretend to aſſert the genuineſs of theſe letters; but I ſee no reaſon of ſufficient weight to deſtroy the credibility of the whole ſtory, which is ſuppoſed to have given occaſion to them [*n*].

The ſucceſs of CHRIST's miniſtry.

VIII. A great number of the Jews, ſtruck with thoſe illuſtrious marks of a divine authority and power, that ſhone forth in the miniſtry and actions of CHRIST, regarded him as the ſon of God, the true MESSIAH. The rulers of the people, and more eſpecially the chief prieſts and Phariſees, whoſe licentiouſneſs and hypocriſy he cenſured with a noble and generous freedom, laboured with ſucceſs, by the help of their paſſions, to extinguiſh in their breaſts the conviction of his celeſtial miſſion, or, at leaſt, to ſuppreſs the effects it was adapted to produce upon their conduct. Fearing alſo leſt the miniſtry of CHRIST ſhould tend to diminiſh their credit, and to deprive them of the advantages they derived from the impious abuſe of their authority in religious matters; they laid ſnares for his life, which, for a conſiderable time, were without effect. They ſucceeded, at length, by the infernal treaſon of an apoſtate diſciple, by the treachery of JUDAS, who diſcovered the retreat which his divine maſter had choſen for the purpoſes of meditation and repoſe, and thus delivered him into the mercileſs hands of a brutal ſoldiery.

[*i*] Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30.

[*k*] Matt. x. 5, 6. xv. 24.

[*l*] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. i. cap. xiii. p. 21. JO. ALBERT FABRIC. *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* tom. i. p. 317.

[*m*] See BASNAGE *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, vol. i. cap. xviii. p. 500. As alſo THEOPH. SIGF. BAYERUS *Hiſtoria Edeſſena et Oſroëna*, lib. iii. p. 104. JOS. SIMON ASSEMANUS *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticanæ*, tom. i. p. 554.

[(*n*) There is no author who has diſcuſſed this queſtion (concerning the authenticity of the letters of CHRIST and ABGARUS, and the truth of the whole ſtory) with ſuch learning and judgment, as the late Mr. JONES, in the ſecond volume of his excellent work, entitled, *A new and full method of ſettling the canonical authority of the New Teſtament.* Notwithſtanding the opinions of ſuch celebrated names as PARKER, CAVE, and GRABE, in favour of theſe letters, and the hiſtory to which they relate, Mr. JONES has offered reaſons to prove the whole fictitious, which ſeem unanſwerable, independent of the authorities of RIVET, CHEMNITIUS, WALTHER, SIMON, DU PIN, WAKE, SPANHEIM, FABRICIUS, and LE CLERC, which he oppoſes to the three abovementioned.]

Death of CHRIST.

IX. In conſequence of this, JESUS was firſt brought before the Jewiſh high-prieſt and ſanhedrim, before whom he was accuſed of having violated the law, and blaſphemed the majeſty of God. Dragged from thence to the tribunal of PILATE the Roman prætor, he was there charged with ſeditious enterpriſes, and with treaſon againſt CÆSAR. Both theſe accuſations were ſo evidently falſe, and deſtitute even of every appearance of truth, that they muſt have been rejected by any judge, who acted upon the principles of common equity. But the clamours of an enraged populace, ſet on by the impious inſtigations of their prieſts and rulers, intimidated PILATE, and engaged him, though with the utmoſt reluctance, and in oppoſition to the dictates of his conſcience, to pronounce a capital ſentence againſt CHRIST. The divine Saviour behaved with inexpreſſible dignity under this heavy trial. As the end of his miſſion was to make expiation for the ſins of men, ſo when all things were ready, and when he had finiſhed the work of his glorious miniſtry, he placidly ſubmitted to the death of the croſs, and with a ſerene and voluntary reſignation, committed his ſpirit into the hands of the Father.

His Reſurrection.

X. After JESUS had remained three days in the ſepulchre, he reſumed that life which he had voluntarily laid down, and, riſing from the dead, declared to the univerſe, by that triumphant act, that the divine juſtice was ſatisfied, and the paths of ſalvation and immortality rendered acceſſible to the human race. He converſed with his diſciples, during forty days after his reſurrection, and employed that time in inſtructing them more fully concerning the nature of his kingdom. Many wiſe and important reaſons prevented his ſhewing himſelf publicly at *Jeruſalem*, to confound the malignity and unbelief of his enemies. He contented himſelf with manifeſting the certainty of his glorious reſurrection to a ſufficient number of faithful and credible witneſſes, foreſeeing, perhaps, that if he appeared in public, thoſe malicious unbelievers, who had formerly attributed his miracles to the power of magic, would now repreſent his reſurrection, as a phantom, or viſion, produced by the influence of infernal powers. After having remained upon earth, during the ſpace of time abovementioned, and given to his diſciples a divine commiſſion to preach the glad tidings of ſalvation and immortality to the human race, he aſcended into heaven, in their preſence, and reſumed the enjoyment of that glory, which he was poſſeſſed of before the worlds were created.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. I.

The apoſtles filled with the Holy Ghoſt.

I. JESUS, being aſcended into heaven, ſoon ſhewed his afflicted diſciples, that, though inviſible to mortal eyes, he was ſtill their omnipotent, protector, and their benevolent guide. About fifty days after his departure from them, he gave them the firſt proof of that majeſty and power to which he was exalted, by the effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt upon them according to his promiſe [*o*]. The conſequences of this grand event were ſurprizing and glorious, infinitely honourable to the Chriſtian religion and the divine miſſion of its triumphant author. For no ſooner had the apoſtles received this precious gift, this celeſtial guide, than their ignorance was turned into light, their doubts into certainty, their fears into a firm and invincible fortitude, and their former backwardneſs into an ardent and inextinguiſhable zeal, which led them to undertake their ſacred office with the utmoſt intrepidity and alacrity of mind. This marvelous event was attended with a variety of gifts, particularly the gift of tongues, ſo indiſpenſably neceſſary to qualify the apoſtles to preach the goſpel to the different nations. Theſe holy apoſtles were alſo filled with a perpect perſuaſion, founded on CHRIST's expreſs promiſe, that the divine preſence would perpetually accompany them, and ſhew itſelf by miraculous interpoſitions, as often as the ſucceſs of their miniſtry ſhould render this neceſſary.

Preach the goſpel firſt to the Jews and Samaritans.

II. Relying upon theſe celeſtial ſuccours, the apoſtles began their glorious miniſtry, by preaching the goſpel, according to CHRIST's poſitive command, firſt to the Jews, and by endeavouring to bring that deluded people to the knowledge of the truth [*p*]. Nor were their labours unſucceſsful, ſince, in a very ſhort time, many thouſands were converted, by the influence of their miniſtry, to the Chriſtian faith [*q*]. From the Jews they paſſed to the Samaritans, to whom they preached with ſuch efficacy, that great numbers of that nation acknowledged the MESSIAH [*r*]. And, after that they had exerciſed their miniſtry, during ſeveral years, at *Jeruſalem*, and brought to a ſufficient degree of conſiſtence and maturity the Chriſtian churches which were founded in *Paleſtine* and the adjacent countries, they extended their views further, carried the divine lamp of the goſpel to all the nations of the world, and ſaw their labours crowned, almoſt every where, with the moſt abundant fruits.

The election of a new apoſtle.

III. No ſooner was CHRIST exalted on high, than the apoſtles determined to render their number complete, as it had been fixed by their divine maſter, and accordingly to chuſe in the place of JUDAS, who had deſperately periſhed by his own hands, a man endowed with ſuch degrees of ſanctity and wiſdom, as were neceſſary in a ſtation of ſuch vaſt importance.. Having therefore gathered together the ſmall aſſembly of Chriſtians, which had then been formed at *Jeruſalem*, two men, remarkable for their piety and faith, were propoſed as the moſt worthy to ſtand candidates for this ſacred office. Theſe men were MATTHIAS and BARSABAS, the former of whom was, either by lot (which is the moſt general opinion) or by a plurality of voices of the aſſembly there preſent, choſen to the dignity of an apoſtle [*s*].

[*o*] Acts ii. 1, &c. [*p*] Luke xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8. xiii. 46. [*q*] Acts ii. 41. iv. 4. [*r*] Acts i. 8. viii. 14.

Paul called to be an apoſtle.

IV. All theſe apoſtles were men without education, and abſolutely ignorant of letters and philoſophy; and yet, in the infancy of the Chriſtian church, it was neceſſary that there ſhould be, at leaſt, ſome one defender of the goſpel, who, verſed in the learned arts, might be able to combat the Jewiſh doctors and the Pagan philoſophers with their own arms. For this purpoſe, JESUS himſelf, by an extraordinary voice from heaven, called to his ſervice a thirteenth apoſtle, whoſe name was SAUL (afterwards PAUL) and whoſe acquaintance both with Jewiſh and Grecian learning was very conſiderable [*t*]. This extraordinary man, who had been one of the moſt virulent enemies of the Chriſtians, became their moſt glorious and triumphant defender. Independent of the miraculous gifts, with which he was enriched, he was naturally poſſeſſed of an invincible courage, an amazing force of genius, and a ſpirit of patience, which no fatigue could overcome, and which no ſufferings or trials could exhauſt. To theſe the cauſe of the goſpel, under the divine appointment, owed a conſiderable part of its rapid progreſs and ſurprizing ſucceſs, as the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and the *Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, abundantly teſtify.

The church of *Jeruſalem*, how conſtituted.

V. The firſt Chriſtian church, founded by the apoſtles, was that of *Jeruſalem*, which was the model of all thoſe that were afterwards erected during this firſt century. This church was, however, governed by the apoſtles themſelves, to whom both the *elders* and thoſe who were entruſted with the care of the poor, even the *deacons*, were ſubject. The people, though they had not abandoned the Jewiſh worſhip, held, however, ſeparate aſſemblies, in which they were inſtructed by the apoſtles and elders, prayed together, celebrated the holy ſupper in remembrance of CHRIST, of his death and ſufferings, and the ſalvation offered to mankind through him, and, at the concluſion of theſe meetings, they teſtified their mutual love, partly by their liberality to the poor, and partly by ſober and friendly repaſts [*u*], which from thence were called *feaſts of charity*. Among the virtues, which diſtinguiſhed the riſing church in this its infancy, that of charity to the poor and needy ſhone in the firſt rank, and with the brighteſt luſtre. The rich ſupplied the wants of their indigent brethren with ſuch liberality and readineſs, that, as St. LUKE tells us, among the primitive diſciples of CHRIST, all things were *in common* [*w*]. This expreſſion has, however, been greatly abuſed, and has been made to ſignify a *community of rights*, *goods*, *or poſſeſſions*, than which interpretation nothing is more groundleſs, nothing more falſe. For from a multitude of reaſons, as well as from the expreſs words of St. PETER [*x*], it is abundantly manifeſt that the community, which is implied in mutual *uſe* and mutual liberality, is the only thing intended in this paſſage [*y*].

[*s*] Acts i. 26. [*t*] Acts ix. 1. [*u*] Acts ii. 42. [*w*] Acts ii. 44. iv. 32.

[*x*] Acts v. 4.

[(*y*) **This is proved with the utmoſt evidence by Dr. MOSHEIM, in a diſſertation, concerning**

Many churches founded by the apoſtles in different places.

VI. The apoſtles, having finiſhed their work at *Jeruſalem*, went from thence to employ their labours in other nations, travelled, with this view, over a great part of the known world, and in a ſhort time planted a vaſt number of churches among the Gentiles. Several of theſe are mentioned in the ſacred writings, particularly in the *Acts of the Apoſtles* [z]; though theſe are, undoubtedly, but a ſmall part of the churches, which were founded either by the apoſtles themſelves, or by their diſciples under their immediate direction. The diſtance of time, and the want of records, leave us at a loſs with reſpect to many intereſting circumſtances of the peregrinations of the apoſtles, nor have we any certain or preciſe accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they ſojourned, nor of the times and places in which they finiſhed their glorious courſe. The ſtories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, the Engliſh, the Spaniards, the Germans, the Americans, the Chineſe, the Indians, and the Ruſſians are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date, to be received by an impartial enquirer after truth. The greateſt part of theſe fables were forged after the time of CHARLEMAGNE, when moſt of the Chriſtian churches contended about the antiquity of their origin, with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, and Greeks diſputed formerly about their ſeniority and precedence.

CHRIST reſpected among the Gentiles.

VII. At the ſame time, the beauty and excellence of the Chriſtian religion excited the admiration of the thinking part of mankind, wherever the apoſtles directed their courſe. Many, who were not willing to adopt the whole of its doctrines, were, nevertheleſs, as appears from undoubted records, ſo ſtruck with the account of CHRIST's life and actions, and ſo charmed with the ſublime purity of his precepts, that they ranked him in the number of the greateſt heros, nay, even of the gods themſelves. Great numbers kept, with the utmoſt care in their houſes, pictures or images of the divine Saviour and his apoſtles, which they treated with the higheſt marks of veneration and reſpect [a]. And ſo illuſtrious was the fame of CHRIST's power grown, after his reſurrection from the dead, and the miraculous gifts ſhed from on high upon his apoſtles, that the emperor TIBERIUS is ſaid to have propoſed his being enrolled among the gods of *Rome*, which the oppoſition of the ſenate hindered from taking effect. Many have doubted of the truth of this ſtory: there are, however, ſeveral authors of the firſt note who have declared, that the reaſons alleged for the truth of this fact are ſuch as have removed their doubts, and appeared to them ſatisfactory and concluſive [b].

---

the true nature of that community of goods, which is ſaid to have taken place in the church of *Jeruſalem*. This learned diſcourſe is to be found in the ſecond volume of our author's incomparable work, entitled, *Diſſertationes ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſticam pertinentes.*]

[z] The names of the churches, planted by the apoſtles in the different nations, are ſpecified in a work of PHIL. JAMES HARTMAN, *De rebus geſtis Chriſtianorum ſub apoſtolis*, cap. vii. p. 107; and alſo in that of F. ALBERT FABRICIUS, entitled, *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, cap. v. p. 83, &c.

[a] This is particularly mentioned by EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. vii. cap. xviii. p. 265. and by IRENÆUS, lib. i. c. xxv.

[b] See THEOD. HASÆUS, *De decreto Tiberii, quo Chriſtum referre voluit in numerum Deorum*; as alſo a very learned letter written, in defence of the truth of this fact, by the celebrated

The cauſes of the rapid propagation of the goſpel.

VIII. When we conſider the rapid progreſs of Chriſtianity among the Gentile nations, and the poor and feeble inſtruments by which this great and amazing event was immediately effected, we muſt naturally have recourſe to an omnipotent and inviſible hand, as its true and proper cauſe. For unleſs we ſuppoſe here a divine interpoſition, how was it poſſible that men, deſtitute of all human aid, without credit or riches, learning or eloquence, could, in ſo ſhort a time, perſuade a conſiderable part of mankind to abandon the religion of their anceſtors? How was it poſſible, that an handful of apoſtles, who, as fiſhermen and publicans, muſt have been contemned by their own nation, and, as Jews, muſt have been odious to all others, could engage the learned and the mighty, as well as the ſimple and thoſe of low degree, to forſake their favourite prejudices, and to embrace a new religion which was an enemy to their corrupt paſſions? And, indeed, there were undoubted marks of a celeſtial power perpetually attending their miniſtry. There was, in their very language, an incredible energy, an amazing power of ſending light into the underſtanding and conviction into the heart. To this were added, the commanding influence of ſtupendous miracles, the foretelling of future events, the power of diſcerning the ſecret thoughts and intentions of the heart, a magnanimity ſuperior to all difficulties, a contempt of riches and honours, a ſerene tranquillity in the face of death, and an invincible patience under torments ſtill more dreadful than death itſelf; and all this accompanied with lives free from all ſtain, and adorned with the conſtant practice of ſublime virtue. Thus were the Meſſengers of the divine Saviour, the heralds of his ſpiritual and immortal kingdom, furniſhed for their glorious work, as the unanimous voice of ancient hiſtory ſo loudly teſtifies. The event ſufficiently declares this; for without theſe remarkable and extraordinary circumſtances, no rational account can be given of the rapid propagation of the goſpel throughout the world.

Miraculous gifts communicated by the apoſtles.

IX. What indeed contributed ſtill further to this glorious event, was, the power veſted in the apoſtles of tranſmitting to their diſciples theſe miraculous gifts. For many of the firſt Chriſtains were no ſooner baptized according to Christ's appointment, and dedicated to the ſervice of God by ſolemn prayer, and the impoſition of hands, than they ſpoke languages they had never known or learned before; fore-told future events, healed the ſick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, reſtored the dead to life, and performed many things above the reach of human power [c]. And it is no wonder, if men, who had the power of communicating to others theſe marvelous gifts,

---

Christopher Iselius, and publiſhed in the *Bibliotheque Germanique*, tom. xxxii. p. 147. and tom. xxxiii. p. 12. [We may add to this note of Dr. Mosheim's, that the late learned profeſſor Altmann, publiſhed at *Bern* in the year 1755, an ingenious pamphlet upon this ſubject, entitled, *Diſquitio Hiſtorico-critica de Epiſtola* Pontii Pilati *ad* Tiberium, *quâ* Christi *miracula, mors et reſurrectio recenſebantur*. This author makes it appear, that, though the letter, which ſome have attributed to Pilate, and which is extant in ſeveral authors, be manifeſtly ſpurious; yet it is no leſs certain, that Pilate ſent to Tiberius an account of the death and reſurrection of Christ. See the *Biblioth. des ſciences, et des beaux arts*, publiſhed at the *Hague*, tom. vi. p. 360.]

[c] See Pfanner's learned treatiſe, *De chariſmatibus ſive donis miraculoſis antiquæ eccleſiæ*, publiſhed at *Francfort* 1683.

appeared great and reſpectable, wherever they exerciſed their glorious miniſtry.

The progreſs of the goſpel attributed to abſurd cauſes.

X. Such then were the true cauſes of that amazing rapidity with which the Chriſtian religion ſpred itſelf upon earth; and thoſe who pretend to aſſign other reaſons of this ſurprizing event, indulge themſelves in idle fictions, which muſt diſguſt every attentive obſerver of men and things. In vain, therefore, have ſome imagined, that the extraordinary liberality of the Chriſtians to their poor, was a temptation to the more indolent and corrupt part of the multitude to embrace the goſpel. Such malignant and ſuperficial reaſoners don't conſider, that thoſe who embraced this divine religion expoſed their lives to the moſt imminent danger; nor have they attention enough to recollect that neither lazy, nor vicious members were ſuffered to remain in the ſociety of Chriſtians. Equally vain is the invention of thoſe, who imagine that the profligate lives of the Heathen prieſts was an occaſion of the converſion of many to Chriſtianity. For, though this might indeed give them a diſguſt at the religion of theſe unworthy miniſters, yet it could not, alone, attach them to that of JESUS, which offered them from the world no other proſpects than thoſe of poverty, infamy, and death. The perſon, who could embrace the goſpel, ſolely, from the motive now mentioned, muſt have reaſoned in this ſenſeleſs and extravagant manner: "The miniſters of that "religion which I have profeſſed from my infancy, lead profligate lives: "therefore, I will become a Chriſtian, join myſelf to that body of men who "are condemned by the laws of the ſtate, and thus expoſe my life and fortune "to the moſt imminent danger."

CHAP. V.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church.

The Jews perſecute the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine.*

I. THE innocence and virtue that diſtinguiſhed ſo eminently the lives of CHRIST's ſervants, and the ſpotleſs purity of the doctrine they taught, were not ſufficient to defend them againſt the virulence and malignity of the Jews. The prieſts and rulers of that abandoned people, not only loaded with injuries and reproach the apoſtles of JESUS, and their diſciples, but condemned as many of them, as they could, to death, and executed in the moſt irregular and barbarous manner their ſanguinary decrees. The murther of STEPHEN, of JAMES the ſon of ZEBEDEE, and of JAMES, ſurnamed the *Juſt*, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, furniſh dreadful examples of the truth of what we here advance [d]. This odious malignity of the Jewiſh doctors, againſt the heralds of the goſpel, was undoubtedly owing to a ſecret apprehenſion, that the progreſs of Chriſtianity would deſtroy the credit of Judaiſm, and bring on the ruin of their pompous ceremonies.

---

[d] The martyrdom of STEPHEN is recorded in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, vii. 55; and that of JAMES the ſon of ZEBEDEE, Acts xii. 1, 2; that of JAMES the *Juſt*, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, is mentioned by JOSEPHUS, in his *Jewiſh Antiquities*, book xx. ch. viii. and by EUSEBIUS, in his *Eccleſ. Hiſtory*, book ii. ch. xxiii.

And alſo by thoſe in foreign countries.

II. The Jews who lived out of *Paleſtine*, in the Roman provinces, did not yield to thoſe of *Jeruſalem* in point of cruelty to the innocent diſciples of CHRIST. We learn from the hiſtory of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and other records of unqueſtionable authority, that they ſpared no labour, but zealouſly ſeized every occaſion of animating the magiſtrates againſt the Chriſtians, and ſetting on the multitude to demand their deſtruction. The high-prieſt of the nation, and the Jews, who dwelt in *Paleſtine*, were inſtrumental in exciting the rage of theſe foreign Jews againſt the infant church, by ſending meſſengers to exhort them not only to avoid all intercourſe with the Chriſtians, but alſo to perſecute them in the moſt vehement manner [e]. For this inhuman order, they endeavoured to find out the moſt plauſible pretexts, and, therefore, they gave out, that the Chriſtians were enemies to the Roman emperor, ſince they acknowledged the authority of a certain perſon whoſe name was JESUS, whom PILATE had puniſhed capitally as a malefactor by a moſt righteous ſentence, and on whom, nevertheleſs, they conferred the royal dignity. Theſe perfidious inſinuations had the intended effect, and the rage of the Jews againſt the Chriſtians was conveyed from father to ſon, from age to age; ſo that the church of CHRIST had, in no period of time, more bitter and deſperate enemies than that very people, to whom the immortal Saviour was more eſpecially ſent.

The Jews ſeverely puniſhed for their treatment of CHRIST, and his diſciples.

III. The ſupreme judge of the world did not let the barbarous conduct of this perfidious nation go unpuniſhed. The moſt ſignal marks of divine juſtice purſued them, and the cruelties they had exerciſed upon CHRIST, and his diſciples, were dreadfully avenged. The God, who had for ſo many ages protected the Jews with an out-ſtretched arm, withdrew his aid. He permitted *Jeruſalem*, with its famous temple, to be deſtroyed by VESPASIAN and his ſon TITUS, an innumerable multitude of this devoted people to periſh by the ſword, and the greateſt part of thoſe that remained to groan under the yoke of a ſevere bondage. Nothing can be more affecting than the account of this terrible event, and the circumſtantial deſcription of the tremendous calamities which attended it, as they are given by JOSEPHUS, himſelf a Jew, and alſo a ſpectator of this horrid ſcene. From this period the Jews experienced, in every place, the hatred and contempt of the Gentile nations, ſtill more than they had formerly done. And in theſe their calamities the predictions of CHRIST were amply fulfilled, and his divine miſſion further illuſtrated.

The ten Gentile perſecutions.

IV. However virulent the Jews were againſt the Chriſtians, yet, upon many occaſions, they wanted power to execute their cruel purpoſes. This was not the caſe with the Heathen nations; and therefore from them the Chriſtians ſuffered the ſevereſt calamities. The Romans are ſaid to have purſued the Chriſtians with the utmoſt violence in ten perſecutions [f], but this number is not verified by the ancient hiſtory of the church. For if by theſe perſecutions, ſuch only are meant as were ſingularly ſevere and univerſal throughout the empire, then it is certain, that theſe amount not to the number abovementioned. And, if we take the provincial and leſs remarkable perſecutions into the account, they far exceed it. In the fifth century, certain Chriſtians were led by ſome paſſages of the holy ſcriptures, and by one eſpecially in the *Revelations* [g], to imagine that the church was to ſuffer ten calamities of a moſt grievous nature. To this notion, therefore, they endeavoured, though not all in the ſame way, to accommodate the language of hiſtory, even againſt the teſtimony of thoſe ancient records, from whence alone hiſtory can ſpeak with authority [h].

---

[e] See the Dialogue of JUSTIN Martyr with TRYPHO the Jew, p. 51, 52, 53. 109. 138. 318.

[f] The learned J. ALBERT FABRICIUS has given us a liſt of the authors that have written concerning theſe perſecutions, in his *Lux Evangelii orbi univerſo exoriens*, cap. vii. p. 133.

Laws made againſt the Chriſtians.

V. NERO was the firſt emperor who enacted laws againſt the Chriſtians. In this he was followed by DOMITIAN, MARCUS ANTONINUS the philoſopher, SEVERUS, and the other emperors, who indulged the prejudices they had imbibed againſt the diſciples of JESUS. All the edicts of theſe different princes were not, however, equally unjuſt, nor made with the ſame views and for the ſame reaſons. Were they now extant, as they were collected by the celebrated lawyer DOMITIUS, in his book concerning the *duty of a Proconſul*, they would undoubtedly caſt a great light upon the hiſtory of the church, under the perſecuting emperors [i]. At preſent we muſt, in many caſes, be ſatisfied with probable conjectures for want of more certain evidence.

The cauſes of the perſecution of the Chriſtians by the Romans.

VI. Before we proceed further in this part of our hiſtory, a very natural curioſity calls us to enquire, how it happened, that the Romans, who were troubleſome to no nation on account of their religion, and who ſuffered even the Jews to live under their own laws, and follow their own method of worſhip, treated the Chriſtians alone with ſuch ſeverity? This important queſtion ſeems ſtill more difficult to be ſolved, when we conſider that the excellent nature of the Chriſtian religion, and its admirable tendency to promote both the public welfare of the ſtate, and the private felicity of the individual, entitled it, in a ſingular manner, to the favour and protection of the reigning powers. One of the principal reaſons of the ſeverity, with which the Romans perſecuted the Chriſtians, notwithſtanding theſe conſiderations, ſeems to have been the abhorrence and contempt, with which the latter regarded the religion of the empire, which was ſo intimately connected with the form, and, indeed, with the very eſſence of its political conſtitution. For, though the Romans gave an unlimited toleration to all religions, which had nothing in their tenets dangerous to the commonwealth, yet they would not permit that of their anceſtors, which was eſtabliſhed by the laws of the ſtate, to be turned into deriſion, nor the people to be drawn away from their attachment to it. Theſe, however, were the two things which the Chriſtians were charged with, and that juſtly, though to their honour. They dared to ridicule the abſurdities of the Pagan ſuperſtition, and they were ardent and aſſiduous in gaining proſelytes to the truth. Nor did they only attack the religion of *Rome*, but alſo all the different ſhapes and forms under which ſuperſtition appeared in the various countries where they exerciſed their miniſtry. From hence the Romans concluded, that the Chriſtian ſect was not only inſupportably daring and arrogant, but, moreover, an enemy to the public tranquillity, and every way proper to excite civil wars and commotions in the empire. It is, probably, on this account, that Tacitus reproaches them with the odious character of *haters of mankind* [k], and ſtyles the religion of Jesus a *deſtructive ſuperſtition*; and that Suetonius ſpeaks of the Chriſtians, and their doctrine, in terms of the ſame kind [l].

---

[g] Revel. xvii. 14.

[h] See SULPITIUS SEVERUS, book ii. ch. xxxiii. As alſo AUSTIN, *De civitate Dei*, book xviii. ch. lii.

[i] The Collection of the imperial edicts againſt the Chriſtians, made by DOMITIUS, and now loſt, is mentioned by LACTANTIUS, in his *Divine Inſtitutes*, book v.ch. xi. Such of theſe edicts, as have eſcaped the ruins of time, are learnedly illuſtrated by FRANC. BALDUINUS, in a ſmall treatiſe, entitled, *Commentarium ad edicta veterum principum Romanorum de Chriſtianis*. Of which a ſecond edition was publiſhed, by Mr. GUNDLING, at *Hall*, 1727.

Other cauſes of theſe perſecutions.

VII. Another circumſtance, that irritated the Romans againſt the Chriſtians, was the ſimplicity of their worſhip, which reſembled, in nothing, the ſacred rites of any other people. The Chriſtians had neither ſacrifices, nor temples, nor images, nor oracles, nor ſacerdotal orders; and this was ſufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined that there could be no religion without theſe. Thus they were looked upon as a ſort of Atheiſts, and, by the Roman laws, thoſe, who were chargeable with Atheiſm, were declared the peſts of human ſociety. But this was not all: the ſordid intereſts of a multitude of lazy and ſelfiſh prieſts were immediately connected with the ruin and oppreſſion of the Chriſtian cauſe. The public worſhip of ſuch an immenſe number of deities was a ſource of ſubſiſtence, and even of riches to the whole rabble of prieſts and augurs, and alſo to a multitude of merchants and artiſts. And as the progreſs of the goſpel threatened the ruin of this religious traffic, and the profits it produced, this raiſed up new enemies to the Chriſtians, and armed the rage of mercenary ſuperſtition againſt their lives and their cauſe [m].

The moſt odious calumnies ſpred abroad againſt the Chriſtians.

VIII. To accompliſh more ſpeedily the ruin of the Chriſtians, thoſe, whoſe intereſts were incompatible with the progreſs of the goſpel, loaded them with the moſt opprobrious calumnies, which were too eaſily received as truth, by the credulous and unthinking multitude, among whom they were diſperſed with the utmoſt induſtry. We find a large account of theſe perfidious and ill-grounded reproaches in the writings of the firſt defenders of the Chriſtian cauſe [n]. And theſe, indeed, were the only arms they had to oppoſe the truth; ſince the excellence of the goſpel, and the virtue of its miniſters and followers, left its enemies no reſources, but calumny and perſecution. Nothing can be imagined, in point of virulence and fury, that they did not employ for the ruin of the Chriſtians. They even went ſo far as to perſuade the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempeſts, and diſeaſes that afflicted mankind, were judgments ſent down by the angry gods, becauſe the Chriſtians, who contemned their authority, were ſuffered in the empire [*o*].

---

[k] *Annal.* lib. xv. cap. xliv.

[l] *In Nerone*, cap. xvi. Theſe odious epithets, which Tacitus gives to the Chriſtians and their religion, as likewiſe the language of Suetonius, who calls Chriſtianity a *poiſonous or maglignant ſuperſtition*, (*malefica ſuperſtitio*) are founded upon the ſame reaſons. A ſect, which not only could not endure, but even laboured to aboliſh the religious ſyſtems of the Romans; and alſo thoſe of all the other nations of the univerſe, appeared to the ſhort-ſighted and ſuperficial obſervers of religious matters, as enemies of mankind, and perſons poſſeſſed with a mortal hatred of all the human race.

[m] This obſervation is verified by the ſtory of Demetrius the ſilver-ſmith, Acts xix. 25. and by the following paſſage in the 97th letter of the xth book of Pliny's epiſtles: "The "temples, which were *almoſt deſerted*, begin to be frequented again; and the ſacred rites, "which have been long neglected, are again performed.—The victims, which have had hitherto "*few purchaſers*, begin to come again to the market, &c."

[n] See the laborious work of Christ. Kortholt, entitled, *Paganus obtrectator, ſeu de ca-*

The puniſhments and judicial forms uſed againſt the Chriſtians.

IX. The various kinds of puniſhment, both capital and corrective, which were employed againſt the Chriſtians, are particularly deſcribed by learned men who have written profeſſedly upon that ſubject [*p*]. The forms of proceſs, uſed in their condemnation, may be ſeen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters of PLINY and TRAJAN, and other ancient monuments [*q*]. Theſe judicial forms were very different, at different times, and changed naturally according to the mildneſs or ſeverity of the laws, enacted by the different emperors againſt the Chriſtians. Thus, at one time, we ſee the moſt diligent ſearch made after the followers of CHRIST; at another, all perquiſition ſuſpended, and poſitive accuſation and information, only, allowed. Under one reign we ſee them, upon their being proved Chriſtians, or their confeſſing themſelves ſuch, immediately dragged away to execution, unleſs they prevent their puniſhment by apoſtaſy; under another, we ſee inhuman magiſtrates endeavouring to compel them, by all ſorts of tortures, to renounce their profeſſion.

Martyrs and confeſſors.

X. Thoſe who, in the perilous times of the church, fell by the hand of bloody perſecution, and expired in the cauſe of the divine Saviour, were called *martyrs*, a term, borrowed from the ſacred writings, which ſignifies *witneſſes*, and thus expreſſes the glorious teſtimony, which theſe magnanimous believers bore to the truth. The title of *confeſſors* was given to ſuch, as in the face of death, and at the expence of honours, fortune, and all the other advantages of the world, had confeſſed with fortitude, before the Roman tribunals, their firm attachment to the religion of JESUS. The veneration that was paid to both *martyrs* and *confeſſors*, is hardly credible. The diſtinguiſhing honours and privileges they enjoyed, the authority, with which their counſels and deciſions were attended, would furniſh ample matter for a hiſtory apart, and ſuch an undertaking might be highly uſeful in many reſpects. There was, no doubt, as much wiſdom, as juſtice, in treating with ſuch reſpect, and inveſting with ſuch privileges, theſe Chriſtian heros; ſince nothing was more adapted to encourage others to ſuffer with chearfulneſs in the cauſe of CHRIST. But, as the beſt and wiſeſt inſtitutions are generally perverted, by the weakneſs or corruption of men, from their original purpoſe; ſo the authority and privileges granted, in the beginning, to martyrs and confeſſors, became, in proceſs of time, a ſupport to ſuperſtition, an incentive to enthuſiaſm, and a ſource of innumerable evils and abuſes.

---

lumniis Gentilium in Chriſtianos; to which may be added, JO. JAC. HULDRICUS, *De calumniis Gentilium in Chriſtianos*, publiſhed at *Zurich*, in 8vo in the year 1744.

[*o*] See ARNOBIUS *Contra gentes*.

[*p*] See for this purpoſe ANT. GALLONIUS and GASP. SAGITARIUS, *De cruciatibus martyrum*.

[*q*] See BÖHMER. *Juris Eccleſ. Proteſtant.* tom. iv. lib. v. *Decretal.* tit. i. § 32. p. 617.

Their number.

XI. The firſt three or four ages of the church were ſtained with the blood of martyrs, who ſuffered for the name of JESUS. The greatneſs of their number is acknowledged by all, who have a competent acquaintance with ancient hiſtory, and who have examined that matter with any degree of impartiality. It is true, the learned DODWELL has endeavoured to invalidate this unanimous deciſion of the ancient hiſtorians [*r*], and to diminiſh conſiderably the number of thoſe that ſuffered death for the goſpel. And after him, ſeveral writers have maintained his opinion, and aſſerted, that whatever may have been the calamities that the Chriſtians, in general, ſuffered for their attachment to the goſpel, very few were put to death on that account. This hypotheſis has been warmly oppoſed, as derogating from that divine power which enabled Chriſtians to be faithful even unto death, and a contrary one embraced which augments prodigiouſly the number of theſe heroic ſufferers. Here, no doubt, it will be wiſe to avoid both theſe extremes, and to hold the middle path, which certainly leads neareſt to the truth. The martyrs were leſs in number, than ſeveral of the ancient and modern writers have ſuppoſed them to be, but much more numerous than DODWELL and his followers are willing to believe. And this medium will be eaſily admitted by ſuch, as have learned from the ancient writers, that, in the darkeſt and moſt calamitous times of the church, all Chriſtians were not equally or promiſcuouſly diſturbed, or called before the public tribunals. Thoſe, who were of the loweſt rank of the people, eſcaped the beſt; their obſcurity, in ſome meaſure, ſkreened them from the fury of perſecution. The learned and eloquent, the doctors and miniſters, and chiefly the rich, after the confiſcation of whoſe fortunes a rapacious magiſtracy were perpetually gaping, theſe were the perſons the moſt expoſed to the dangers of the times.

Their lives and actions.

XII. The actions and ſayings of theſe holy martyrs, from the moment of their impriſonment to their laſt gaſp, were carefully recorded, in order to be red on certain days, and thus propoſed as models to future ages. But few, however, of theſe ancient acts are come down to our times [*s*]; the greateſt part of them having been deſtroyed during that dreadful perſecution which DIOCLETIAN carried on ten years, with ſuch fury, againſt the Chriſtians. For a moſt diligent ſearch was then made after all their books and papers, and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. From the eighth century downwards, ſeveral Greek and Latin writers endeavoured to make up this loſs, by compiling, with vaſt labour, an account of the lives and actions of the ancient martyrs. But the moſt of them have given us little elſe than a ſeries of fables, adorned with profuſion of rhetorical flowers, and ſtriking images, as the wiſer, even among the Romiſh doctors, frankly acknowledge. Nor are thoſe records, that paſs under the name of *martyrology*, worthy of ſuperior credit, ſince they bear the moſt evident marks both of ignorance and falſhood. So that, upon the whole, this part of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, for want of ancient and authentick monuments, is extremely imperfect, and neceſſarily attended with much obſcurity.

[*r*] See DODWELL's diſſertation, *De paucitate martyrum*, in his *Diſſertationes Cyprianicæ*.

[*s*] Such of thoſe acts as are worthy of credit have been collected by the learned RUINARTUS, into one volume in folio, of a moderate ſize, entitled, *Selecta et ſincera martyrum acta*. Amſtelod. 1713. The hypotheſis of DODWELL is amply refuted in a laboured preface which the author has prefixed to this work.

The perſecution under Nero.

XIII. It would have been ſurprizing, if, under ſuch a monſter of cruelty as NERO, the Chriſtians had enjoyed the ſweets of tranquillity and freedom. But this was far from being the caſe; for this perfidious tyrant accuſed them of having ſet fire to the city of *Rome*, that horrid crime, which he himſelf had committed with a barbarous pleaſure. In avenging this crime upon the innocent Chriſtians, he ordered matters ſo, that the puniſhment ſhould bear ſome reſemblance to the offence. He, therefore, wrapt up ſome of them in combuſtible garments, and ordered fire to be ſet to them when the darkneſs came on, that thus, like torches, they might diſpel the obſcurity of the night; while others were faſtened to croſſes, or torn in pieces by wild beaſts, or put to death in ſome ſuch dreadful manner. This horrid perſecution was ſet on foot in the month of *November* [*t*], in the 64th year of CHRIST, and in it, according to ſome ancient accounts, St. PAUL and St. PETER ſuffered martyrdom; though this latter fact is conteſted by many, as being abſolutely irreconcilable with chronology [*u*]. The death of NERO, who periſhed miſerably in the year 68, put an end to the calamities of this firſt perſecution, under which, during the ſpace of four years, the Chriſtians ſuffered every ſort of torment and affliction, which the ingenious cruelty of their enemies could invent.

The extent of this perſecution.

XIV. Learned men are not entirely agreed concerning the extent of this perſecution under NERO. Some confine it to the city of *Rome*, while others repreſent it as having raged throughout the whole empire. The latter opinion, which is alſo the moſt ancient [*w*], is undoubtedly to be preferred; as it is certain, that the laws enacted againſt the Chriſtians, were enacted againſt the whole body, and not againſt particular churches, and were conſequently in force, in the remoteſt provinces. The authority of TERTULLIAN confirms this, who tells us that NERO and DOMITIAN had enacted laws againſt the Chriſtians, of which TRAJAN had, in part, taken away the force, and rendered them, in ſome meaſure, without effect [*x*]. We ſhall not have recourſe, for a further confirmation of this opinion, to that famous Portugueſe or Spaniſh inſcription, in which NERO is praiſed for having *purged that province from the new ſuperſtition*; ſince that inſcription is juſtly ſuſpected to be a mere forgery, and the beſt Spaniſh authors conſider it as ſuch [*y*]. But we may, however, make one obſervation, which will tend to illuſtrate the point in queſtion, and that is, that ſince the Chriſtians were condemned by NERO, not ſo much on account of their religion, as for the falſely-imputed crime of burning the city [*z*], it is ſcarcely to be imagined, that he would leave unmoleſted, even beyond the bounds of *Rome*, a ſect whoſe members were accuſed of ſuch an abominable deed.

[*t*] See, for a further illuſtration of this point of chronology, two French diſſertations of the very learned ALPHONSE de VIGNOLES, concerning the cauſe and the commencement of the perſecution under NERO, which are printed in MASSON's *Hiſtore critique de la republique des lettres*, tom. viii. p. 74—117. tom. ix. p. 172—186. See alſo TOINARD. *Ad Lactantium de mortibus perſequut*. p. 398.

[*u*] See TILLEMONT *Hiſtore des empereurs*, tom. i. p. 564. BARATIER, *De ſucceſſione Romanor. Pontif.* cap. v. p. 60.

[*w*] This opinion was firſt defended by FRANC. BALDUIN, in his *Comm. ad edicta imperator. in Chriſtianos*, p. 27, 28. After him LAUNOIUS maintained the ſame opinion in his *Diſſert. quâ Sulpitii Severi locus de prima martyrum Galliæ epocha vindicatur*, § 1. p. 139, 140. tom. ii. part I. *opp.* This opinion, however, is ſtill more acutely and learnedly defended by DODWELL, in the xith of his *Diſſertationes Cyprianicæ*.

[*x*] *Apologet.* cap. iv. p. 46. according to the edition of HAVERCAMP.

The perſecution under Domitian.

XV. Though, immediately after the death of NERO, the rage of this firſt perſecution againſt the Chriſtians ceaſed, yet the flame broke out a-new in the year ninety-three or ninety-four, under DOMITIAN, a prince little inferior to NERO in all ſorts of wickedneſs [*a*]. This perſecution was occaſioned, if we may give credit to HEGESIPPUS, by the fears that DOMITIAN was under of loſing the empire [*b*]; for he had been informed, that, among the relations of CHRIST, a man ſhould ariſe, who, poſſeſſed of a turbulent and ambitious ſpirit, was to excite commotions in the ſtate, and aim at ſupreme dominion. However that may have been, the perſecution renewed by this unworthy prince was extremely violent, though his untimely death put a ſtop to it not long after it commenced. FLAVIUS CLEMENS, a man of conſular dignity, and FLAVIA DOMITILLA his niece, or, as ſome ſay, his wife, were the principal martyrs that ſuffered in this perſecution, in which alſo the apoſtle JOHN was baniſhed to the iſle of *Patmos*. TERTULLIAN and other writers inform us, that, before his baniſhment, he was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, from whence he came forth not only living, but even unhurt. This ſtory, however, is not atteſted in ſuch a manner, as to leave no remaining doubt about its certainty [*c*].

[*y*] This celebrated inſcription is publiſhed by the learned GRUTERUS, in the firſt volume of his Inſcriptions, p. ccxxxviii. n. 9. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that the beſt Spaniſh writers dare not venture to defend the genuineſs and authority of this inſcription, as it has not been ſeen by any of them, and was firſt produced by CYRIAC of ANCONA, a perſon univerſally known to be utterly unworthy of the leaſt credit. We ſhall add here the judgment which the excellent hiſtorian of Spain, JO. de FERRERAS, has given of this inſcription, in his *Hiſtoire générale d'Eſpagne*, tom. i. p. 192. " Je ne puis m'empêcher (ſays he) d'obſerver que Cyriac " d'Ancone fut le premier qui publia cette inſcription, et que c'eſt de lui que les autres l'ont tirée : " mais comme la foi de cet Ecrivain eſt ſuſpect au jugement de tous les ſavans, que d'ailleurs il " n'y a ni veſtige, ni ſouvenir de cette inſcription dans les places où l'on dit qu'elle s'eſt trouvée, " et qu'on ne ſçait où la prendre à preſent, chacun peut en porter le jugement qu'il voudra."

[*z*] See THEOD. RUINART. *Præf. ad acta martyrum ſincera et ſelecta*, f. 31, &c.

[*a*] Idem, *Præf. ad acta martyrum*, &c. f. 33. THOM. ITTIGIUS *Selectis Hiſtor. Eccl. Capit.* Sæc. i. cap. vi. § 11. p. 331.

[*b*] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. xix, xx.

[*c*] See MOSHEIM's *Syntagma diſſert. ad hiſtoriam eccleſ. pertinentium*, p. 497—546.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Containing an account of the STATE *of* LEARNING *and* PHILOSOPHY.

CENT. I.

The ſtate of philoſophy in the eaſt not ſufficiently known.

I. IF we had any certain or ſatisfactory account of the doctrines, which were received among the wiſer of the eaſtern nations, when the light of the goſpel firſt roſe upon the world, this would contribute to illuſtrate many important points in the ancient hiſtory of the church. But the caſe is quite otherwiſe: the fragments of the ancient oriental philoſophy that are come down to us, are, as every one knows, few in number; and ſuch as they are, they yet require the diligence, erudition, and ſagacity of ſome learned man, to collect them into a body, to arrange them with method, and to explain them with perſpicuity [*d*].

The philoſophy of the Perſians, Chaldæans, and Arabians.

II. The doctrine of the *magi*, who believed the univerſe to be governed by *two principles*, the one good, and the other evil, flouriſhed in *Perſia*. Their followers, however, were not all agreed concerning the nature of theſe principles [*e*]; but this did not prevent the propagation of the main doctrine, which was received throughout a conſiderable part of *Aſia* and *Africa*, eſpecially among the Chaldæans, Aſſyrians, Syrians, and Egyptians, though with different modifications, and had even infected the Jews themſelves [*f*]. The Arabians at that time, and even afterwards, were more remarkable for ſtrength and courage than for genius and ſagacity, nor do they ſeem, according to their own confeſſion [*g*], to have acquired any great reputation for wiſdom and philoſophy before the time of MAHOMET.

The wiſdom of the Indians and Egyptians.

III. From the earlieſt times the Indians were diſtinguiſhed by their taſte for ſublime knowledge and wiſdom. We might, perhaps, be able to form a judgment of their philoſophical tenets, if that moſt ancient book, which they looked upon as particularly ſacred, and which they call *veda*, or the law, were brought to light and tranſlated into ſome known language. But the accounts, which are given of this remarkable book, by thoſe who have been in the *Indies*, are ſo various and irreconcilable with each other, that we muſt yet wait for further ſatisfaction on this head [*b*]. As to the Egyptians, they were divided, as every one knows, into a multitude of ſects and opinions [*i*]; ſo that their labour ſeems exceeding fruitleſs, who endeavour to reduce the philoſophy of this people to one ſyſtem.

[*d*] The hiſtory of the oriental philoſophy by Mr. STANLEY; though it is not void of all kind of merit, is yet extremely defective. That learned author is ſo far from having exhauſted his ſubject, that he has left it, on the contrary, in many places wholly untouched. The hiſtory of philoſophy publiſhed, in Germany, by the very learned Mr. BRUCKER, is vaſtly preferable to Mr. STANLEY's work; and the German author, indeed, much ſuperior to the Engliſh one, both in point of genius and of erudition.

[*e*] See HYDE's *Hiſtory of the religion of the ancient Perſians*, a work full of erudition and diſorder, and interſperſed with conjectures of the moſt improbable kind.

[*f*] See a treatiſe of JO. CHRISTOPH. WOLF, publiſhed at *Hamburg*, in 1707, under the title of *Manichæiſmus ante Manichæos.* See alſo MOSHEIM's *Obſervations upon* CUDWORTH's *Intellectual ſyſtem of the univerſe*, p. 328. 423.

[*g*] See ABULPHARAIUS, *De moribus Arabum*, publiſhed by POCOCK.

The oriental philoſophy, properly ſo called.

IV. But of all the different ſyſtems of philoſophy that were received in *Aſia* and *Africa* about the time of our Saviour, none was ſo detrimental to the Chriſtian religion, as that which was ſtyled *gnoſis*, or ſcience, i. e. *the way to the true knowledge of the deity*, and which we have above called the *oriental doctrine*, in order to diſtinguiſh it from the Grecian philoſophy. It was from the boſom of this pretended oriental wiſdom, that the chiefs of thoſe ſects, which in the three firſt centuries perplexed and afflicted the Chriſtian church, originally iſſued forth. Theſe ſupercilious doctors, endeavouring to accommodate to the tenets of their fantaſtic philoſophy, the pure, the ſimple, and ſublime doctrines of the ſon of God, brought forth, as the reſult of this jarring compoſition, a multitude of idle dreams and fictions, and impoſed upon their followers a ſyſtem of opinions, which were partly ludicrous, and partly perplexed with intricate ſubtilties, and covered over with impenetrable obſcurity. The ancient doctors, both Greek and Latin, who oppoſed theſe ſects, conſidered them as ſo many branches that derived their origin from the platonic philoſophy. But this was pure illuſion: an apparent reſemblance between certain opinions of PLATO, and ſome of the tenets of the eaſtern ſchools, deceived theſe good men, who had no knowledge but of the Grecian philoſophy, and were abſolutely ignorant of the oriental doctrines. Whoever compares the platonic and gnoſtic philoſophy together, will eaſily perceive the wide difference that there is between them.

The firſt principles of this philoſophy.

V. The firſt principles of the oriental philoſophy ſeem perfectly conſiſtent with the dictates of reaſon; for its firſt founder muſt undoubtedly have argued in the following manner: "There are many evils in this world, and men "ſeem impelled by a natural inſtinct to the practice of thoſe things which "reaſon condemns; but that eternal mind, from which all ſpirits derive "their exiſtence, muſt be inacceſſible to all kinds of evil, and alſo of a moſt "perfect and beneficent nature; therefore the origin of thoſe evils, with "which the univerſe abounds, muſt be ſought ſomewhere elſe than in the "deity. It cannot reſide in him who is all perfection; and therefore it muſt "be *without* him. Now, there is nothing *without* or *beyond* the deity, but "*matter*; therefore *matter* is the center and ſource of all evil, of all vice." Having taken for granted theſe principles, they proceeded further, and affirmed, that matter was eternal, and derived its preſent form, not from the will of the ſupreme God, but from the creating power of ſome inferior intelligence, to whom the world and its inhabitants owed their exiſtence. As a proof of this aſſertion, they alleged that it was incredible, that the ſupreme deity, perfectly good, and infinitely removed from all evil, ſhould either create or modify matter, which is eſſentially malignant and corrupt, or beſtow upon it, in any degree, the riches of his wiſdom and liberality. They were, however, aware of the inſuperable difficulties that lay againſt their ſyſtem; for when they were called to explain, in an accurate and ſatisfactory manner, how this rude and corrupt matter came to be arranged into ſuch a regular and harmonious frame as that of the univerſe, and, particularly, how celeſtial ſpirits were joined to bodies formed out of its malignant maſs, they were ſadly embarraſſed, and found that the plaineſt dictates of reaſon declared their ſyſtem incapable of defence. In this perplexity, they had recourſe to wild fictions and romantic fables, in order to give an account of the formation of the world, and the origin of mankind.

[*b*] I have lately heard that this moſt important, and long-expected book has been acquired by ſome French jeſuits, who are miſſionaries in the Indies, and who have ſent it over to the king of France his library. It is alſo ſaid, that it is already tranſlated, or will be ſo immediately. See *Lettre du P. Calmette à M. de Cartigny, dans les Lettres edifiantes et curieuſes des Miſſions Etrangeres*, xxi. *Recueil*, p. 455. as alſo *Recueil* xxiii. p. 161.

[*i*] See MOSHEIM's *Obſervations on the Intellectual Syſtem*, &c. in his Latin tranſlation of that work, tom. i. p. 415.

The oriental philoſophers divided in their ſentiments.

VI. Thoſe who, by mere dint of fancy and invention, endeavour to caſt a light upon obſcure points, or to ſolve great and intricate difficulties, are ſeldom agreed about the methods of proceeding, and, by a neceſſary conſequence, ſeparate into different ſects. Such was the caſe of the oriental philoſophers, when they ſet themſelves to explain the difficulties mentioned above. Some imagined *two eternal principles* from whence all things proceeded, the one preſiding over *light*, and the other over *matter*, and, by their perpetual conflict, explained the mixture of good and evil, that appears in the univerſe. Others maintained, that the being, which preſided over matter, was not an eternal principle, but a ſubordinate intelligence, one of thoſe whom the ſupreme God produced from himſelf. They ſuppoſed that this being was moved, by a ſudden impulſe, to reduce to order the rude maſs of matter, which lay excluded from the manſions of the deity, and alſo to create the human race. A third ſort fell upon a ſyſtem different from the two preceding, and formed to themſelves the notion of a *triumvirate* of beings, in which the *ſupreme deity* was diſtinguiſhed both from the *material, evil principle*, and from the *creator* of this ſublunary world. Theſe, then, were the three leading ſects of the oriental philoſophy, which were ſubdivided into various factions, by the diſputes that aroſe, when they came to explain more fully their reſpective opinions, and to purſue them into all their monſtrous conſequences. Theſe multiplied diviſions were the natural and neceſſary conſequences of a ſyſtem which had no ſolid foundation, and was no more, indeed, than an airy phantom, blown up by the wanton fancies of ſelf-ſufficient men. And that theſe diviſions did really ſubſiſt, the hiſtory of the Chriſtian ſects, that embraced this philoſophy, abundantly teſtifies.

Their opinions concerning the deity.

VII. It is, however, to be obſerved, that as all theſe ſects were founded upon one common principle, their diviſions did not prevent their holding, in common, certain opinions concerning the deity, the univerſe, the human race, and ſeveral other ſubjects. They were all, therefore, unanimous in acknowledging the exiſtence of an eternal nature, in whom dwelt the fulneſs of wiſdom, goodneſs, and all other perfections, and of whom no mortal was able to form a complete idea. This great being was conſidered by them, as a moſt pure and radiant *light*, diffuſed through the immenſity of ſpace, which they called *pleroma*, a Greek word, which ſignifies fullneſs; and they taught concerning him, and his operations, the following things: "The *eternal nature*, infinitely perfect and infinitely happy, having dwelt from everlaſting in a profound ſolitude, and in a bleſſed tranquillity, produced, at length, from *itſelf*, two minds of a different ſex, which reſembled their ſupreme parent in the moſt perfect manner. From the prolific union of theſe two beings others aroſe, which were alſo followed by ſucceeding generations; ſo that, in proceſs of time, a celeſtial family was formed in the *pleroma* [*k*]. This divine progeny, being immutable in its nature, and above the power of mortality, was called, by the philoſophers, *æon* [*l*]," a term which ſignifies, in the Greek language, an eternal nature. How many in number theſe *æons* were, was a point much controverted among the oriental ſages.

Concerning the origin of this world.

VIII. "Beyond the manſions of *light*, where dwells the *deity* with his celeſtial offspring, there lies a rude and unwieldy maſs of *matter*, agitated by innate, turbulent, and irregular motions. One of the celeſtial natures deſcending from the *pleroma*, either by a fortuitous impulſe, or in conſequence of a divine commiſſion, reduced to order this unſeemly maſs, adorned it with a rich variety of gifts, created men, and inferior animals of different kinds to ſtore it with inhabitants, and corrected its malignity by mixing with it a certain portion of light, and alſo of a matter celeſtial and divine. This creator of the world is diſtinguiſhed from the ſupreme deity by the name of *demiurge*. His character is a compound of ſhining qualities, and

---

[(*k*) It appears highly probable, that the apoſtle PAUL had an eye to this fantaſtic mythology, when, in the firſt chapter of his *Firſt Epiſtle to Timothy*, ℣ 4. he exhorts him not to *give head to fables and endleſs* GENEALOGIES; *which miniſter queſtions*, &c.]

[(*l*) The word *αἰὼν*, or *æon*, is commonly uſed by the Greek writers, but in different ſenſes. Its ſignification in the Gnoſtic ſyſtem is not extremely evident, and ſeveral learned men have deſpaired of finding out its true meaning. *Αἰὼν*, or *æon*, among the ancients, was uſed to ſignify the age of man, or the duration of human life. In aftertimes it was employed by philoſophers to expreſs the duration of ſpiritual and inviſible beings. Theſe philoſophers uſed the word *χρόνος*, as the meaſure of corporeal and changing objects; and *αἰὼν*, as the meaſure of ſuch as were immutable and external. And as God is the chief of thoſe immutable beings, which are ſpiritual, and conſequently not to be perceived by our outward ſenſes, his infinite and eternal duration was expreſſed by the term *αἰὼν*, or *æon*, and that is the ſenſe in which that word is now commonly underſtood. It was, however, afterwards attributed to other ſpiritual and inviſible beings; and the oriental philoſophers, who lived about the time of CHRIST's appearance upon earth, and made uſe of the Greek language, underſtood by it the *duration* of eternal and immutable things, the *ſpace* or period of time, in which they exiſt. Nor did the variations, through which this word paſſed, end here: from expreſſing only the *duration* of beings, it was by a *metonymy* employed to ſignify the beings themſelves. Thus the ſupreme being was called *αἰὼν*, or *æon*; and the angels diſtinguiſhed alſo by the the title of *æons*. All this will lead us to the true meaning of that word among the Gnoſtics. They had formed to themſelves the notion of an inviſible and ſpiritual world, compoſed of *entities* or *virtues*, proceeding from the ſupreme being, and ſucceeding each other at certain intervals of time, ſo as to form an *eternal chain*, of which our world was the terminating link; a notion of eternity very different from that of the Platoniſts, who repreſented it as ſtable, permanent, and void of ſucceſſion. To the beings that formed this eternal chain, the Gnoſtics aſſigned a certain term of duration and a certain ſphere of action. Their *terms of duration* were, at firſt, called *αἰῶνες*, and they themſelves were afterwards *metonymically* diſtinguiſhed by that title.]

"inſupportable arrogance; and his exceſſive luſt of empire effaces his talents "and his virtues. He claims dominion over the new world he has formed, "as his ſovereign right; and, excluding totally the ſupreme deity from all "concernment in it, he demands from mankind, for himſelf and his aſſociates, divine honours."

Concerning the ſtate and deſtination of human ſouls.

IX. "Man is a compound of a terreſtrial and corrupt body, and a ſoul "which is of celeſtial origin, and, in ſome meaſure, an emanation from the "divinity. This nobler part is miſerably weighed down and encumbred by "the body, which is the ſeat of all irregular luſts and impure deſires. It is "this body that ſeduces the ſoul from the purſuit of truth, and not only "turns it from the contemplation and worſhip of the ſupreme being, ſo as "to confine its homage and veneration to the creator of this world, but "alſo attaches it to terreſtrial objects, and to the immoderate purſuit of ſenſual "pleaſures, by which its nature is totally polluted. The ſovereign mind "employs various means to deliver his offſpring from this deplorable ſervitude, eſpecially, the miniſtry of divine meſſengers whom he ſends to enlighten, to admoniſh, and to reform the human race. In the mean time, "the imperious *demiurge* exerts his power in oppoſition to the merciful purpoſe of the ſupreme being, reſiſts the influence of thoſe ſolemn invitations, "by which he exhorts mankind to return to him, and labours to efface the "knowledge of God in the minds of intelligent beings. In this conflict, ſuch "ſouls, as, throwing off the yoke of the creators and rulers of this world, riſe "to their ſupreme parent, and ſubdue the turbulent and ſinful motions, which "corrupt *matter* excites within them, ſhall, at the diſſolution of their mortal "bodies, aſcend directly to the *pleroma*. Thoſe, on the contrary, who remain in the bondage of ſervile ſuperſtition, and corrupt matter, ſhall, at "the end of this life, paſs into new bodies, until they awake from their ſinful lethargy. In the end, however, the ſupreme God ſhall come forth "victorious, triumph over all oppoſition, and, having delivered from their "ſervitude the greateſt part of thoſe ſouls that are impriſoned in mortal "bodies, ſhall diſſolve the frame of this viſible world, and involve it in a "general ruin. After this ſolemn period, primitive tranquillity ſhall be reſtored in the univerſe, and God ſhall reign with happy ſpirits, in undiſturbed felicity, through the everlaſting ages."

Of the Jewiſh philoſophy.

X. Such were the principal tenets of the oriental philoſophy. The ſtate of letters and philoſophy among the Jews comes next under conſideration; and of this we may form ſome idea from what has been ſaid already concerning that nation. It is chiefly to be obſerved, that the dark and hidden ſcience, which they called the *kabbala*, was, at this time, taught and inculcated by many among that ſuperſtitious people [m]. This ſcience, in many things, bears a ſtrong reſemblance to the oriental philoſophy, or, to ſpeak more accurately, it is indeed that ſame philoſophy accommodated to the Jewiſh religion, and tempered with a certain mixture of truth. Nor were the doctrines of the Grecian ſages unknown to the Jews at the period now before us; ſince from the time of ALEXANDER the GREAT, ſome of them had been admitted, even into the Moſaic religion. We ſhall ſay nothing concerning the opinions which they adopted from the philoſophical and theological ſyſtems of the Caldæans, Egyptians, and Syrians [*n*].

---

[m] See JO. FRANC. BUDDEI *Introductio in Hiſtoriam Philoſ. Hebræorum*; and alſo the authors which B. WOLF mentions, with encomiums, in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, tom. iii.

The ſtate of learning in *Greece*.

XI. The Greeks, in the opinion of moſt writers, were yet in poſſeſſion of the firſt rank among the nations that cultivated letters and philoſophy. In many places, and eſpecially at *Athens*, there were a conſiderable number of men diſtinguiſhed by their learning, acuteneſs, and eloquence; philoſophers of all ſects, who taught the doctrines of PLATO, ARISTOTLE, ZENO, and EPICURUS; rhetoricians alſo and men of genius, who inſtructed the youth in the rules of eloquence, and formed their taſte for the liberal arts. So that thoſe who had a paſſion for the ſtudy of oratory, reſorted in multitudes to the Grecian ſchools in order to perfect themſelves in that noble ſcience. *Alexandria*, in *Egypt*, was alſo much frequented for the ſame purpoſe, as a great number of the Grecian philoſophers and rhetoricians dwelt in that city.

At *Rome*.

XII. The Romans alſo, at this time, made a ſhining figure among the poliſhed and learned nations. All the ſciences flouriſhed at *Rome*. The youth of a higher rank were early inſtructed in the Greek language and eloquence. From thence they proceeded to the ſtudy of philoſophy, and the laws of their country; and they finiſhed their education by a voyage into *Greece*, where they not only gave the laſt degree of perfection to their philoſophical ſtudies, but alſo acquired that refined wit and elegance of taſte, that ſerved to ſet off their more ſolid attainments in the moſt advantageous manner [*o*]. None of the philoſophical ſects were more in vogue among the Romans than the Epicureans and the Academics, which were peculiarly favoured by the great, who, ſoothed by their doctrines into a falſe ſecurity, indulged their paſſions without remorſe, and continued in their vicious purſuits without terror. During the reign of AUGUSTUS, the culture of polite learning and of the fine arts, was held in great honour, and thoſe that contributed with zeal and ſucceſs to this, were eminently diſtinguiſhed by that prince. But, after his death, learning languiſhed without encouragement, and was neglected, becauſe the ſucceeding emperors were more intent upon the arts of war and rapine, than thoſe more amiable arts and inventions that are the fruits of leiſure and peace.

In the other nations.

XIII. With reſpect to the other nations, ſuch as the Germans, Celts, and Bretons, it is certain, that they were not deſtitute of learned and ingenious men. Among the Gauls, the people of *Marſeilles* had long acquired a ſhining reputation for their progreſs in the ſciences [*p*]; and there is no doubt, but that the neighbouring countries received the benefit of their inſtructions.

[*n*] See JO. FRANC. BUDDEI *Introductio in Hiſtoriam Philoſ. Hebræorum*; as alſo the authors recommended by WOLF in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, tom. iii.

[*o*] See PAGANANI GAUDENTII *Liber de Philoſophiæ apud Romanos initio et progreſſu*, in TERTIO FASCICULO *Novæ Collectionis Variorum Scriptorum.* Halæ 1717.

[*p*] See the *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France par des Religieux Benedictins*: Diſſert. Prelim. p. 42, &c.

Among the Celts, their druids, prieſts, philoſophers, and legiſlators were highly remarkable for their wiſdom; but their writings, at leaſt ſuch as are yet extant, are not ſufficient to inform us of the nature of their philoſophy [q]. The Romans, indeed, introduced letters and philoſophy into all the provinces, which ſubmitted to their victorious arms, in order to ſoften the rough manners of the ſavage nations, and form in them, imperceptibly, the ſentiments and feelings of humanity [r].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government.

The neceſſity of public teachers.

I. THE great end of CHRIST's miſſion was to form an univerſal church, gathered out of all the nations of the world, and to extend the limits of this great ſociety from age to age. But, in order to this, it was neceſſary, firſt, to appoint *extraordinary teachers*, who, converting the Jews and Gentiles to the truth, ſhould erect, every where, Chriſtian aſſemblies; and then, to eſtabliſh *ordinary miniſters*, and interpreters of the divine will, who ſhould enforce and repeat the doctrines delivered by the former, and maintain the people in their holy profeſſion, and in the practice of the Chriſtian virtues. For the beſt ſyſtem of religion muſt neceſſarily either dwindle to nothing, or be egregiouſly corrupted, if it is not perpetually inculcated and explained by a regular and ſtanding miniſtry.

Extraordinary teachers.

II. The *extraordinary* teachers, whom CHRIST employed to lay the foundations of his everlaſting kingdom, were the XII apoſtles, and the LXX diſciples, of whom mention has been made above. To theſe the Evangeliſts are to be added, by which title thoſe were diſtinguiſhed whom the apoſtles ſent to inſtruct the nations, or who, of their own accord, abandoned every worldly attachment, and conſecrated themſelves to the ſacred office of propagating the goſpel [s]. In this rank, alſo, we muſt place thoſe, to whom, in the infancy of the church, the marvelous power of ſpeaking in foreign languages which they had never learned, was communicated from above. For the perſon to whom the divine omnipotence and liberality had imparted the gift of tongues, might conclude, with the utmoſt aſſurance, from the gift itſelf (which a wiſe being would not beſtow in vain) that he was appointed by God to miniſter unto the truth, and to employ his talents in the ſervice of Chriſtianity [t].

---

[q] JAC. MARTIN, *Religion des Gaulois*, livr. i. cap. xxi. p. 175.

[r] JUVENAL. Satyr. xv. ℣ 110.

"Nunc totus Graias noſtraſque habet orbis Athenas,
"Gallia Cauſſidicos docuit facunda Britannos,
"De conducendo loquitur jam Rhetore Thule."

[s] See St. PAUL's *Epiſtle to the Epheſians*, iv. 11. As alſo EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. xxxvii.

[t] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

III. Many

The authority of the apoſtles.

III. Many have undertaken to write the hiſtory of the apoſtles [u], a hiſtory, which we find loaded with fables, doubts, and difficulties, when we purſue it further than the books of the New Teſtament, and the moſt ancient writers in the Chriſtian church. In order to have a juſt idea of the nature, privileges, and authority of the apoſtolic function, we muſt conſider an apoſtle as a perſon who was honoured with a divine commiſſion, inveſted with the power of *making laws*, of *controlling and reſtraining the wicked*, when that was expedient, and of *working miracles*, when neceſſary; and ſent to mankind, *to unfold to them the divine will, to open to them the paths of ſalvation and immortality, and to ſeparate from the multitude, and unite in the bonds of one ſacred ſociety, thoſe who were attentive and obedient to the voice of God addreſſed to men by their miniſtry* [w].

The LXX diſciples.

IV. The accounts we have of the LXX diſciples, are ſtill more obſcure than thoſe of the apoſtles; ſince the former are only once mentioned in the New Teſtament (Luke x. 1). The illuſtrations that we have yet remaining, relative to their character and office, are certainly compoſed by the more modern Greeks, and, therefore, can have but little authority or credit [x]. Their commiſſion extended no further than the Jewiſh nation, as appears from the expreſs words of St. LUKE; though it is highly probable, that, after CHRIST's aſcenſion, they performed the function of Evangeliſts, and declared the glad tidings of ſalvation, and the means of obtaining it, through different nations and provinces.

The external form of the church not determined by CHRIST.

V. Neither CHRIST himſelf, nor his holy apoſtles, have commanded any thing clearly or expreſly concerning the external form of the church, and the preciſe method, according to which it ſhould be governed [y.] From this we may infer, that the regulation of this was, in ſome meaſure, to be accommo-

---

[u] The authors who have written concerning the apoſtles, are enumerated by SAGITTARIUS in his *Introduction to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, ch. i. p. 2; and alſo by BUDDÆUS, in his treatiſe, *De Eccleſia Apoſtolica*, p. 674.

[w] See FRED. SPANHEIM, *De apoſtolis et apoſtolatu*, tom. ii. *opp.* p. 289. It is not without weighty reaſons, and without having conſidered the matter attentively, that I have ſuppoſed the apoſtles inveſted with the power of *enacting laws*. I am ſenſible that ſome very learned men among the moderns have denied this power, but I apprehend they differ from me rather in words than in any thing elſe.

[x] Theſe accounts are to be ſeen at the end of three books, concerning the life and death of MOSES, which were diſcovered and illuſtrated by GILB. GAULMINUS, and republiſhed by JO. ALBERT FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* p. 474.

[y] Thoſe who imagine that CHRIST himſelf, or the apoſtles by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed form of church government, are not agreed what that form was. The principal opinions that have been adopted upon this head may be reduced to the four following: The *firſt* is, that of the Roman Catholics, who maintain, "That CHRIST's intention and appointment was, that his followers ſhould be collected into one ſacred empire, ſubjected to the government of St. PETER and his ſucceſſors, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into ſeveral provinces; that, in conſequence thereof, PETER fixed the ſeat of eccleſiaſtical dominion at *Rome*, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three greater provinces, according to the diviſion of the world at that time, and appointed a perſon to preſide in each who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch reſided at *Rome*, the Aſiatic at *Antioch*, and the African at *Alexandria*; that the biſhops of each province, among whom alſo there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their reſpective patriarchs, and that both biſhops and patriarchs were to be paſ-

The form of the firſt church at *Jeruſalem.*

dated to the time, and left to the wiſdom and prudence of the chief rulers, both of the ſtate and of the church. If, however, it is true, that the apoſtles acted by divine inſpiration, and in conformity with the commands of their bleſſed maſter (and this no Chriſtian can call in queſtion) then it follows, that that form of government which the primitive churches borrowed from that of *Jeruſalem*, the firſt Chriſtian aſſembly eſtabliſhed by the apoſtles themſelves, muſt be eſteemed as of divine inſtitution. But from this it would be wrong to conclude that ſuch a form is immutable and ought to be invariably obſerved, for this a great variety of events may render impoſſible. In thoſe early times, every Chriſtian church conſiſted of the *people*, their *leaders*, and the *miniſters*,

"ſively ſubject to the ſupreme dominion of the Roman Pontif*." This romantic account ſcarcely deſerves a ſerious refutation. The *ſecond* opinion, concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a *ſupreme head*, or of *patriachs*, conſtituted by divine authority, but ſuppoſes that the apoſtles divided the Roman empire into as many eccleſiaſtical provinces, as there were ſecular, or civil ones; that the *metropolitan* biſhop, *i. e.* the prelate, who reſided in the capital city of each province, preſided over the clergy of that province, and that the other biſhops were ſubject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by ſome of the moſt learned of the Romiſh church †, and has alſo been favoured by ſome of the moſt eminent Britiſh divines ‡. Some Proteſtant writers of note have endeavoured to prove that it is not ſupported by ſufficient evidence ‖. The *third* opinion is, that of thoſe who acknowledge, that, when the Chriſtians began to multiply exceedingly, *metropolitans*, *patriarchs*, and *arch-biſhops* were, indeed, created, but only by *human* appointment and authority; though they confeſs, at the ſame time, that it is conſonant to the orders and intention of CHRIST and his apoſtles, that, in every Chriſtian church, there ſhould be one perſon inveſted with the higheſt authority, and cloathed with certain rights and privileges above the other doctors of that aſſembly. This opinion has been embraced by many Engliſh divines of the firſt rank in the learned world, and alſo by many in other countries and communions. The *fourth* and laſt opinion is, that of the Preſbyterians, who affirm that CHRIST's intention was, that the Chriſtian doctors and miniſters ſhould all enjoy the ſame rank and authority, without any ſort of pre-eminence or ſubordination, any diſtinction of rights and privileges.—This account of the *four* different opinions with reſpect to church-government, I have taken from Dr. MOSHEIM's *Larger hiſtory of the firſt century*. This learned and impartial writer, who condemns with reaſon, the *fourth* opinion, as it is explained by thoſe bigotted Puritans, who look upon all ſubordination, and variety of rank among the doctors of the church, as condemnable and Anti-chriſtian, obſerves, however, with equal reaſon, that this opinion may be explained and modified ſo, as to reconcile the moderate abettors of the epiſcopal diſcipline, with the leſs rigid Preſbyterians. The opinion modified by Dr. MOSHEIM amounts to this: "That the Chriſtian doctors are *equal*, in this ſenſe; that CHRIST has left no poſitive "and ſpecial decree which conſtitutes a diſtinction among them, nor any *divine* commandment "by which thoſe, who, in conſequence of the appointments of human wiſdom, are in the higher "ranks, can demand, by a divine right, the obedience and ſubmiſſion of the inferior doctors, *&c.* "their abſtaining from the exerciſe of certain functions, *&c.*"

The truth of the matter is, that CHRIST, by leaving this matter undetermined, has, of conſequence, left Chriſtian ſocieties a diſcretionary power of modelling the government of the church in ſuch a manner, as the circumſtantial reaſons of times, places, *&c.* may require; and therefore the wiſeſt government of the church, is the beſt and the moſt divine; and every Chriſtian ſociety has a right to make laws for itſelf, provided, that theſe laws are conſiſtent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Chriſtianity.]

---

* See LEON ALLATIUS, *De perpetua conſenſ. Eccleſ. Orient. et Occident.* lib. i. cap. ii. MORINUS *Exercitat. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. i. *Exer.* i.

† PETRUS DE MARCA, *De concord. ſacerdot. et imperii*, lib. vi. cap. i. MORINUS *Exerc. Eccl.* lib. i. *Ex.* xviii. PAGI *Critica in annal. Baronii ad A.* xxxvii. tom. i. p. 29.

‡ HAMMOND, *Diſſ. de Epiſcop.* BEVERGE, *Cod. Canon. Vet. Eccleſ. Vindic.* lib. ii. cap. v. tom. ii. *Patr. Apoſt.* USSER. *De origine Epiſcop. et Metropol.* p. 20.

‖ BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. liv. i. cap. viii. BÖEHMER. *Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de concordia ſacerd. et imperii*, p. 143.

or *deacons*, and theſe, indeed, belong eſſentially to every religious ſociety. The people were, undoubtedly, the firſt in authority; for the apoſtles ſhewed, by their own example, that nothing of moment was to be carried on or determined without the conſent of the aſſembly [z], and ſuch a method of proceeding was both prudent and neceſſary in thoſe critical times.

The rights of the people.

VI. It was, therefore, the aſſembly of the people, which choſe their own rulers and teachers, or received them, by a free and authoritative conſent, when recommended by others. The ſame people rejected or confirmed, by their ſuffrages, the laws, that were propoſed by their rulers to the aſſembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; reſtored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; paſſed judgment upon the different ſubjects of controverſy and diſſenſion, that aroſe in their community; examined and decided the diſputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exerciſed all that authority which belongs to ſuch as are inveſted with the ſovereign power.

Their oblations.

The people, indeed, had, in ſome meaſure, purchaſed theſe privileges by adminiſtring to the ſupport of their rulers, miniſters, and poor, and by offering large and generous contributions, when the ſafety or intereſts of the community rendered them neceſſary. In theſe ſupplies each one bore a part proportioned to his circumſtances; and the various gifts which were thus brought into the public aſſemblies, were called *oblations*.

A perfect equality among the primitive Chriſtians.

VII. There reigned among the members of the Chriſtian church, however diſtinguiſhed they were by worldly rank and titles, not only an amiable harmony, but alſo a perfect equality. This appeared by the *feaſts of charity*, in which all were indiſcriminately aſſembled; by the names of *brethren* and *ſiſters*, with which they mutually ſaluted each other; and by ſeveral circumſtances of a like nature. Nor, in this firſt century, was the diſtinction made between Chriſtians of a more or leſs perfect order, which took place afterwards. Whoever acknowledged CHRIST as the Saviour of mankind, and made a ſolemn profeſſion of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized and received into the church. But, in proceſs of time, when the church began to flouriſh, and its members to increaſe, it was thought prudent and neceſſary to divide Chriſtians into two orders, diſtinguiſhed by the names of *believers* and *catechumens*. The former were thoſe, who had been ſolemnly admitted into the church by baptiſm, and in conſequence thereof, were inſtructed in all the myſteries of religion, had acceſs to all the parts of divine worſhip, and were authorized to vote in the eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies. The latter were ſuch, as had not yet been dedicated to God and CHRIST by baptiſm, and were, therefore, admitted neither to the public prayers, nor to the holy communion, nor to the eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies.

Believers and catechumens.

The rulers of the church.

VIII. The rulers of the church were called either *preſbyters* [a], or *biſhops*, which two titles are, in the New Teſtament, undoubtedly applied to the ſame order

---

[z] Acts i. 15. vi. 3. xv. 4. xxi. 22.

[(a) The word *preſbyter*, or elder, is taken from the Jewiſh inſtitution, and ſignifies rather the venerable prudence and wiſdom of old age, than age itſelf.]

Preſbyters, or biſhops.

order of men [*b*]. Theſe were perſons of eminent gravity, and ſuch as had diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their ſuperior ſanctity and merit [*c*]. Their particular functions were not always the ſame, for while ſome of them confined their labours to the inſtruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church. Hence the diſtinction between *teaching* and *ruling preſbyters*, has been adopted by certain learned men. But, if ever this diſtinction exiſted, which I neither affirm nor deny, it certainly did not continue long; ſince it is manifeſt, that St. PAUL requires that all biſhops or preſbyters be qualified and ready to teach and inſtruct [*d*].

The prophets.

IX. Among the firſt profeſſors of Chriſtianity, there were but few men of learning; few, who had capacity enough to inſinuate into the minds of a groſs and ignorant multitude, the knowledge of divine things. God therefore, in his infinite wiſdom, judged it neceſſary to raiſe up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, who were to diſcourſe, in the public aſſemblies, upon the various points of the Chriſtian doctrine, and to treat with the people, in the name of God, as guided by his direction, and cloathed with his authority. Such were the *Prophets of the New Teſtament* [*e*], an order of men, whoſe commiſſion is too much limited by the writers, who confine it to the interpretation of the books of the Old Teſtament and, eſpecially, the Prophecies [*f*]. For it is certain, that they, who claimed the rank of *Prophets*, were inveſted with the power of cenſuring publicly ſuch as had been guilty of any irregularity. But, to prevent the abuſes, that deſigning men might make of this inſtitution, by pretending to this extraordinary character in order to execute unworthy ends, there were always preſent, in the public auditories, judges, divinely appointed, who, by certain and infallible marks, were able to diſtinguiſh the falſe prophets from the true. This order of *prophets* ceaſed, when the want of teachers, which gave riſe to it, was abundantly ſupplied.

Deacons of the church at *Jeruſalem*.

X. The church was, undoubtedly, provided from the beginning with inferior miniſters or *deacons*. No ſociety can be without its ſervants, and ſtill leſs ſuch ſocieties, as thoſe of the firſt Chriſtians were. And it appears not only probable, but evident, that the *young men*, who carried away the dead bodies of ANANIAS and SAPPHIRA, were the ſubordinate miniſters, or *deacons* of the church of *Jeruſalem*, who attended the apoſtles to execute their orders [*g*]. Theſe firſt *deacons* of the church being choſen from among the

---

[*b*] Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[*c*] 1 Tim. iii. 1. Tit. i. 5.

[*d*] 1 Tim. iii. 2, &c. See, concerning the word *preſbyter*, the illuſtrations given by the learned VITRINGA, *De ſynagoga vetere*, lib. iii. part I. cap. i. p. 609; and by the venerable JO. BENED. CARPZOVIUS, in his *Exerc. in Epiſt. ad Hebræos ex Philone*, p. 499. As to the *preſbyters* themſelves, and the nature of their office, the reader will receive much ſatisfaction from the accounts that are given of that order by BUDDÆUS, *De Eccleſia Apoſtolica*, cap. vi. p. 719. and by the moſt learned PFAFFIUS, *De originibus juris eccleſ.* p. 49.

[*e*] Rom. xiii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 28. xiv. 3. 29. Eph. iv. 11.

[*f*] See MOSHEIM's diſſertation *De illis qui* PROPHETÆ *vocantur in Novo Fœdere*, which is to be found in the ſecond volume of his *Syntagma Diſſertationum ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſ. pertinentium.*

[*g*] Acts v. 6. 10.

Thoſe who may be ſurprized at my affirming, that the *young men*, mentioned in the paſſages here referred to, were the *deacons*, or miniſters of the church of *Jeruſalem*, are deſired to conſider, that the words νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι, i. e. *young men*, are not always uſed to determine the age

Jews, who were born in *Paleſtine*, were ſuſpected by the foreign Jews of partiality in diſtributing the offerings, which were preſented for the ſupport of the poor [*h*]. To remedy, therefore, this diſorder, ſeven other deacons were choſen, by order of the apoſtles, and employed in the ſervice of that part of the church of *Jeruſalem*, which was compoſed of the foreign Jews, converted to Chriſtianity. Of theſe new miniſters, ſix were foreigners, as appears by their names: the ſeventh was choſen out of the Proſelytes, of whom there were a certain number among the firſt Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem*, and to whom it was reaſonable, that ſome regard ſhould be ſhewn, in the election of the deacons, as well as to the foreign Jews. All the other Chriſtian churches followed the example of that of *Jeruſalem*, in whatever related to the choice and office of the deacons. Some, particularly the eaſtern churches, elected *deaconeſſes*, and choſe, for that purpoſe, matrons or widows of eminent ſanctity, who alſo miniſtered to the neceſſities of the poor, and performed ſeveral other offices, that tended to the maintenance of order and decency in the church [*i*].

Biſhops.

XI. Such was the conſtitution of the Chriſtian church in its infancy, when its aſſemblies were neither numerous nor ſplendid. Three or four preſbyters, men of remarkable piety and wiſdom, ruled theſe ſmall congregations in perfect harmony, nor did they ſtand in need of any preſident or ſuperior to maintain concord and order where no diſſenſions were known. But the number of the preſbyters and deacons increaſing with that of the churches,

---

of the perſons to whom they are applied, but are frequently employed to point out their *offices*, or functions, both by the Greek and Latin writers. The ſame rule of interpretation, that diverſifies the ſenſe of the word *preſbyter* (which, as all know, ſignifies ſometimes the *age* of a perſon, and, at other times, his *function)* is manifeſtly applicable to the word before us. As, therefore, by the title of *preſbyters* the heads or rulers of a ſociety are pointed out, without any regard to their age; ſo by the term *young men*, we are often to underſtand *miniſters* or *ſervants*, becauſe ſuch are generally in the flower of youth. This interpretation may be confirmed by examples, which are not wanting even in the New Teſtament. CHRIST himſelf ſeems to attribute this ſenſe, to the word νεώτερος, Luke xxii. 26. ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος. Our Saviour explains the term μείζων, by the word ἡγούμενος, and it therefore ſignifies a *preſbyter*, or ruler: he alſo ſubſtitutes a little after, ὁ διακονῶν, in the place of νεώτερος, which confirms our interpretation in the moſt unanſwerable manner. So that μείζων and νεώτερος are not here indications of certain ages, but of certain functions, and the precept of CHRIST amounts to this: "He that "performs the office of a preſbyter or elder among you, let him not think himſelf ſuperior to "the miniſters or deacons." The paſſage of 1 Pet. v. 5. is ſtill more expreſs to our purpoſe: Ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. It is evident from the preceding verſes, that *preſbyter* here is the name of an office, and points out a ruler or teacher of the church; and that the term νεώτερος is alſo to be interpreted not *young men* in point of age, but the *miniſters*, or ſervants of the church. St. PETER, having ſolemnly exhorted the preſbyters, not to abuſe the power that was committed to them, addreſſes his diſcourſe to the miniſters, or *deacons* of the church: "But like"wiſe, ye younger, *i. e.* miniſters and deacons, deſpiſe not the orders of the preſbyters or elders, "but perform chearfully whatſoever they command you." In the ſame ſenſe, does St. LUKE employ this term, Acts v. 6. 10. and his νεώτεροι and νεανίσκοι are, undoubtedly, the deacons of the church of *Jeruſalem*, of whom the Greek Jews complain afterwards to the apoſtles (Acts vi. 1, &c.) on account of the partial diſtribution of the alms. I might confirm this ſenſe of the word *young men* by numberleſs citations from Greek and Roman writers, and a variety of authors ſacred and profane, but this is not the proper place for demonſtrations of this nature.

[*h*] Acts vi. 1, &c.

[*i*] For an ample account of the *deacons* and *deaconeſſes* of the primitive church, ſee ZEIGLER, *De diaconis et diaconiſſis*, cap. xix. p. 347. BASNAGII *Annal. Polit. Eccleſ. ad A.* xxxv. tom. i. p. 450. BINGHAM, *Orig. Eccleſ.* lib. ii, cap. xx.

and the ſacred work of the miniſtry growing more painful and weighty, by a number of additional duties, theſe new circumſtances required new regulations. It was then judged neceſſary, that one man of diſtinguiſhed gravity and wiſdom ſhould preſide in the council of preſbyters, in order to diſtribute among his colleagues their ſeveral taſks, and to be a center of union to the whole ſociety. This perſon was, at firſt, ſtyled the *angel* [k] of the church to which he belonged, but was afterward diſtinguiſhed by the name of *biſhop*, or inſpector; a name borrowed from the Greek language, and expreſſing the principal part of the epiſcopal function, which was to inſpect into, and ſuperintend the affairs of the church. It is highly probable, that the church of *Jeruſalem*, grown conſiderably numerous, and deprived of the miniſtry of the apoſtles, who were gone to inſtruct the other nations, was the firſt which choſe a preſident or biſhop. And it is no leſs probable, that the other churches followed by degrees ſuch a reſpectable example.

The nature of the epiſcopal dignity in this century.

XII. Let none, however, confound the biſhops of this primitive and golden period of the church with thoſe of whom we read in the following ages. For, though they were both diſtinguiſhed by the ſame name, yet they differed extremely, and that in many reſpects. A biſhop, during the firſt and ſecond century, was a perſon who had the care of one Chriſtian aſſembly, which, at that time, was, generally ſpeaking, ſmall enough to be contained in a private houſe. In this aſſembly he acted not ſo much with the authority of a *maſter*, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful *ſervant*. He inſtructed the people, performed the ſeveral parts of divine worſhip, attended the ſick, and inſpected into the circumſtances and ſupplies of the poor. He charged, indeed, the preſbyters with the performance of thoſe duties and ſervices, which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impoſſible for him to fulfil; but had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the conſent of the preſbyters and people. And, though the epiſcopal office was both laborious, and ſingularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely ſmall, ſince the church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts, or *oblations* of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconſiderable, and were moreover to be divided between the biſhops, preſbyters, deacons, and poor.

The origin of dioceſes and chorepiſcopi.

XIII. The power and juriſdiction of the biſhops were not long confined to theſe narrow limits, but ſoon extended themſelves, and that by the following means. The biſhops, who lived in the cities, had, either by their own miniſtry, or that of their preſbyters, erected new churches in the neighbouring towns and villages. Theſe churches, continuing under the inſpection and miniſtry of the biſhops, by whoſe labours and counſels they had been engaged to embrace the goſpel, grew imperceptibly into eccleſiaſtical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called *dioceſes*. But as the biſhop of the city could not extend his labours and inſpection to all theſe churches in the country and in the villages, ſo he appointed certain ſuffragans or deputies to govern and to inſtruct theſe new ſocieties, and they were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *chorepiſcopi*, i. e. country biſhops. This order held the middle rank between biſhops and preſbyters, being inferior to the former, and ſuperior to the latter.

---

[k] Rev. ii. 3.

Whether councils and metropolitans are to be placed in the firſt century.

XIV. The churches, in thoſe early times, were entirely independent; none of them ſubject to any foreign juriſdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers and its own laws. For, though the churches founded by the apoſtles, had this particular difference ſhewn them, that they were conſulted in difficult and doubtful caſes; yet they had no juridical authority, no ſort of ſupremacy over the others, nor the leaſt right to enact laws for them. Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches, nor does there even appear, in this firſt century, the ſmalleſt trace of that aſſociation of provincial churches, from which *councils* and *metropolitans* derive their origin. It was only in the ſecond century that the cuſtom of holding councils commenced in *Greece*, from whence it ſoon ſpred through the other provinces [*l*].

The principal writers, the apoſtles, and their diſciples.

XV. The principal place among the Chriſtian doctors, and among thoſe alſo, who by their writings were inſtrumental in the progreſs of the truth, is due to the apoſtles and certain of their diſciples, who were ſet apart and inſpired by God, to record the actions of Christ and his apoſtles. The writings of theſe holy men, which are comprehended in the books of the New Teſtament, are in the hands of all who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians. Thoſe who are deſirous of particular information with reſpect to the hiſtory of theſe ſacred books, and the arguments which prove their divine authority, their genuineſs, and purity, muſt conſult the learned authors who have written profeſſedly upon that matter [*m*].

The time when the canon was fixed.

XVI. The opinions, or rather the conjectures of the learned, concerning the time when the books of the New Teſtament were collected into one volume, as alſo about the authors of that collection, are extremely different. This important queſtion is attended with great and almoſt inſuperable difficulties to us in theſe latter times [*n*]. It is, however, ſufficient for us to know, that, before the middle of the ſecond century, the greateſt part of the books of the New Teſtament were red in every Chriſtian ſociety throughout the world, and received as a divine rule of faith and manners. Hence it appears, that theſe ſacred writings were carefully ſeparated from ſeveral human compoſitions upon the ſame ſubject, either by ſome of the apoſtles themſelves, who lived ſo long, or by their diſciples and ſucceſſors, who were ſpred abroad through all nations [*o*]. We are well aſſured [*p*], that the *four goſpels* were collected during the life of St. JOHN, and that the three firſt received the approbation of this divine apoſtle. And why may we not ſuppoſe that the other books of the New Teſtament were gathered together at the ſame time.

[*l*] The meeting of the church of *Jeruſalem*, mentioned in the xvth chapter of the Acts, is commonly conſidered as the *firſt Chriſtian council*. But this notion ariſes from a manifeſt abuſe of the word *council*. That meeting was only of one church, and, if ſuch a meeting be called a *council*, it will follow that there were innumerable councils in the primitive times. But every one knows, that a *council* is an aſſembly of deputies or commiſſioners ſent from ſeveral churches aſſociated by certain bonds in a general body, and therefore the ſuppoſition abovementioned falls to the ground.

[*m*] For the hiſtory of the books of the New Teſtament, ſee particularly Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. iv. cap. v. p. 122—227. The ſame learned author has given an accurate liſt of the writers, who have defended the divinity of theſe ſacred books, in his *Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum pro verit. relig. Chriſtianæ*, cap. xxvi. p. 502.

[*n*] See Jo. Ens, *Bibliotheca S. ſeu Diatriba de librorum* N. T. *Canone*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 1710; as alſo Jo. Mill. *Prolegomen. ad Nov. Teſt.* § 1. p. 23.

Apocryphal and ſpurious writings.

XVII. What renders this highly probable is, that the moſt urgent neceſſity required its being done. For, not long after CHRIST's aſcenſion into heaven, ſeveral hiſtories of his life and doctrines, full of pious frauds, and fabulous wonders, were compoſed by perſons, whoſe intentions, perhaps, were not bad, but whoſe writings diſcovered the greateſt ſuperſtition and ignorance. Nor was this all: many productions appeared which were impoſed upon the world by fraudulent men, as the writings of the holy apoſtles [*q*]. Theſe apocryphal and ſpurious writings muſt have produced a ſad confuſion, and rendered both the hiſtory and the doctrine of CHRIST uncertain, had not the rulers of the church uſed all poſſible care and diligence in ſeparating the books that were truly apoſtolical and divine from all that ſpurious traſh, and conveying them down to poſterity in one volume.

Clemens, biſhop of *Rome*.

XVIII. The writer, whoſe fame in this ſurpaſſed that of all others in this century, the apoſtles excepted, was CLEMENS biſhop of *Rome*. The accounts which remain of his life, actions, and death, are for the moſt part uncertain [*r*]. *Two Epiſtles to the Corinthians* [*s*], written in Greek, have been attributed to him, of which the *ſecond* has been looked upon as ſpurious, and the *firſt* as genuine, by many learned writers [*t*]. But even this latter ſeems to have been corrupted and interpolated by ſome ignorant and preſumptuous author, who appears to have been diſpleaſed at obſerving a defect of learning and genius in the writings of ſo great a man as CLEMENS [*u*].

[*o*] See FRICKIUS, *De cura Veteris Eccleſiæ circa Canon.* cap. iii. p. 86.

[*p*] This is expreſly affirmed by EUSEBIUS, in the xxivth chapter of the third book of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.

[*q*] Such of theſe writings as are yet extant have been carefully collected by the learned FABRICIUS, in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Teſtamenti*, which work is publiſhed in two volumes. Many ingenious and learned obſervations have been made on theſe ſpurious books by the celebrated BEAUSOBRE, in his *Hiſtoire Critique des dogmes de Manichée*, livre ii. p. 337, &c.

[*r*] After TILLEMONT, COTELERIUS and GRABE have given ſome accounts of this great man. And all that has been ſaid concerning him by the beſt and moſt credible writers, has been collected by RONDININI, in the firſt of two books publiſhed at *Rome*, in the year 1706, under the following title, *Libri Duo de S. Clemente, Papa, et Martyre, ejuſque Baſilica in urbe Roma*.

[*s*] J. A. FABRICIUS, in the vth chapter of the fourth book of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, mentions the editions that have been given of St. CLEMENT's epiſtles. To this account we muſt add the edition publiſhed at *Cambridge*, in 1718, which is preferable to the preceding ones in many reſpects.

[(*t*) See LARDNER's diſſertation on that ſubject; as alſo the extract given of it, and the reply made to it, in the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée*, tom i. par. II and III. See alſo the controverſy carried on between the learned VENEMA profeſſor at *Franeker*, and the no leſs learned WETSTEIN of *Amſterdam*, in the year 1754, concerning the authenticity of CLEMENT's epiſtles. The reader will find an account of this controverſy in the *Bibliotheque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, tom. ii. p. 51, &c. 311, &c.]

[*u*] See J. BAPT. COTELERII *Patres Apoſt.* tom. i. p. 133. and BERNARDI *Adnotatiunculæ in Clementem*, in the laſt edition of theſe *fathers* publiſhed by LE CLERC. The learned WOTTON has endeavoured, though without ſucceſs, in his obſervations on the epiſtles of CLEMENS, to refute the annotations abovementioned.

The writings falſely attributed to him.

XIX. The learned are now unanimous in regarding the other writings which bear the name of CLEMENS, viz. *the apoſtolic canons*, *the apoſtolic conſtitutions*, *the recognitions of* CLEMENS *and* CLEMENTINA, as ſpurious productions aſcribed by ſome impoſtor to this venerable prelate, in order to procure them a high degree of authority [*w*]. The *apoſtolical canons*, which conſiſt of LXXXV *eccleſiaſtical laws*, contain a view of the church-government and diſcipline received among the Greek and Oriental Chriſtians in the ſecond and third century. The VIII *books of apoſtolical conſtitutions* are the work of ſome auſtere and melancholy author, who, having taken it into his head to reform the Chriſtian worſhip, which he looked upon as degenerated from its original purity, made no ſcruple to prefix to his rules the names of the apoſtles, that thus they might be more ſpeedily and favourably received [*x*]. The *recognitions of* CLEMENS, which differ very little from the CLEMENTINA, are the witty and agreeable production of an Alexandrian Jew, well verſed in philoſophy. They were written in the third century, with a deſign to anſwer, in a new manner, the objections of the Jews, philoſophers, and gnoſtics, againſt the Chriſtian religion, and the careful peruſal of them will be extremely uſeful to ſuch as are curious of information with reſpect to the ſtate of the Chriſtian church in the primitive times [*y*].

Ignatius, biſhop of *Antioch*.

XX. IGNATIUS, biſhop of *Antioch*, ſucceeds CLEMENS in the liſt of the *apoſtolic fathers*, among whom were placed ſuch Chriſtian doctors as had converſed with the apoſtles themſelves, or their diſciples. This pious and venerable man, who was the diſciple and familiar friend of the apoſtles, was, by the order of TRAJAN, brought to *Rome*, and expoſed to wild beaſts in the public theatre, where he ſuffered martyrdom with the utmoſt conſtancy [*z*]. There are yet extant ſeveral epiſtles attributed to him, concerning the authenticity, of which there have been, however, tedious and warm diſputes among the learned, which ſtill ſubſiſt. Of theſe epiſtles, ſeven are ſaid to have been written by this eminent martyr, during his journey from *Antioch* to *Rome*; and theſe the moſt of learned men acknowledge to be genuine, as they ſtand in the edition that was publiſhed in the laſt century from a manuſcript in the Medicean library. The others are generally rejected as ſpurious. As to my own ſentiments of this matter, though I am willing to adopt this opinion as preferable to any other, yet I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the

---

[*w*] For an account of the fate of theſe writings, and the editions that have been given of them, it will be proper to conſult two diſſertations of the learned ITTIGIUS, the one, *De Patribus Apoſtolicis*, which he has prefixed to his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apoſtolicorum*; and the other, *De Pſeudepigraphis Apoſtolicis*, which he has ſubjoined to the Appendix of his book *De Hæreſiarchis ævi Apoſtolici*. See alſo FABRICIU'S *Bibliotheca Græca*, lib. v. cap. i. p. 31, &c. and lib. vi. cap. i. p. 4.

[*x*] BUDDEUS has collected the various opinions of the learned concerning the *Apoſtolical Canons and Conſtitutions*, in his *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, par. II. ch. v. p. 746.

[*y*] See for a full account of this work MOSHEIM'S diſſertation, *De turbata per recentiores Platonicos Eccleſiæ*, § 34. p. 174. This diſſertation is in the firſt volume of that learned work, which our author publiſhed ſome years ago under the title of *Syntagma Diſſertationum ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſticam pertinentium*.

[*z*] See TILLEMONT'S *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. ii. par. II. p. 42—80.

Epiſtle to POLYCARP as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of ſtyle; and, indeed, the whole queſtion, relating to the epiſtles of St. IGNATIUS in general, ſeems to me to labour under much obſcurity, and to be embarraſſed with many difficulties [*a*].

Polycarp.

XXI. The *Epiſtle to the Phillippians*, which is attributed to POLYCARP biſhop of *Smyrna*, who, in the middle of the ſecond century, ſuffered martyrdom in a venerable and advanced age, is looked upon by ſome as genuine; by others, as ſpurious; and it is no eaſy matter to determine this queſtion [*b*].

Barnabas.

The *Epiſtle of* BARNABAS was the production of ſome Jew, who, moſt probably, lived in this century, and whoſe mean abilities and ſuperſtitious attachment to Jewiſh fables, ſhew, notwithſtanding the uprightneſs of his intentions, that he muſt have been a very different perſon from the true BARNABAS, who was St. PAUL's companion [*c*]. The work, which is entitled, *The ſhepherd of* HERMAS, becauſe the angel, who bears the principal part in it, is repreſented in the form and habit of a ſhepherd, was compoſed in the ſecond century by HERMAS, who was brother to PIUS biſhop of *Rome* [*d*]. This whimſical and viſionary writer has taken the liberty to invent ſeveral dialogues or converſations between God and the angels, in order to inſinuate, in a more eaſy and agreeable manner, the precepts which he thought uſeful and ſalutary, into the minds of his readers. But, indeed, the diſcourſe, which he puts into the mouths of thoſe celeſtial beings, is more inſipid and ſenſeleſs, than what we commonly hear among the meaneſt of the multitude [*e*].

The general character of the apoſtolic fathers.

XXII. We may here remark in general, that thoſe apoſtolic fathers, and the other writers, who, in the infancy of the church, employed their pens in the cauſe of Chriſtianity, were neither remarkable for their learning, nor their eloquence. On the contrary, they expreſs the moſt pious and admirable ſentiments in the plaineſt and moſt illiterate ſtyle [*f*]. This, indeed, is rather a matter of honour than of reproach to the Chriſtian cauſe; ſince we ſee from the converſion of a great part of mankind to the goſpel by the miniſtry of weak and illiterate men, that the progreſs of Chriſtianity is not to be attributed to human means, but to a divine power.

[*a*] For an account of this controverſy, concerning the genuineſs of the epiſtles of IGNATIUS, it will be proper to conſult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS, lib. v. cap. i. p. 38–47.

[*b*] For an account of this martyr, and of the epiſtle attributed to him, TILLEMONT's *Memoires*, &c. vol. ii. par. II. p. 287; as alſo FABRICII *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v. cap. i. p. 47.

[*c*] See TILLEMONT's *Memoires*, &c. vol i. par. III. p. 1043. ITTIGIUS's *Select. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Capita*, § i. cap. i. § 14. p. 173. and lib. v. cap. i. § 4. p. 4.

[*d*] This now appears with the utmoſt evidence from a very ancient fragment of a ſmall book, concerning the canon of the Holy Scriptures, which the learned LUD. ANTON. MURATORI publiſhed ſome years ago from an ancient manuſcript in the library at *Milan*, and which is to be found in the *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, tom. iii. diſſ. xliii. p. 853.

[*e*] We are indebted for the beſt edition of the *Shepherd of* HERMAS to FABRICIUS, who has added it to the third volume of his *Codex Apocryphus N. Teſtamenti*. We find alſo ſome account of this writer in the *Biblioth. Græca*, of the ſame learned author, book v. ch. ix. § 9. p. 7. and alſo in ITTIGIUS's diſſertation, *De Patribus Apoſtolicis*, § 55. p. 184, &c.

[*f*] All the writers mentioned in this chapter are uſually called *apoſtolic fathers*. Of theſe writers JO. BAPT. COTELERIUS, and after him LE CLERC, have publiſhed a collection in two volumes, accompanied both with their own annotations, and the remarks alſo of other learned men.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The nature of the Chriſtian religion.

I. THE whole of the Chriſtian religion is comprehended in two great points, of which the firſt regards what we are to believe, and the other relates to our conduct and actions; or to expreſs the matter more briefly, the goſpel preſents to us objects of *faith* and rules of *practice*. The former are expreſſed by the apoſtles by the term *myſtery* or the *truth*; and the latter by that of *godlineſs* or *piety* [g]. The rule and ſtandard of both are thoſe books which contain the Revelation, that God made of his will to perſons choſen for that purpoſe, whether before or after the birth of CHRIST. And theſe divine books are uſually called *The Old and New Teſtament*.

Method of interpreting the ſcriptures.

read

II. The apoſtles and their diſciples took all poſſible care, and that in the earlieſt times of the church, that theſe ſacred books might be in the hands of all Chriſtians, that they might be red and explained in the aſſemblies of the faithful, and thus contribute, both in private and in public, to excite and nouriſh in the minds of Chriſtians a fervent zeal for the truth, and a firm attachment to the ways of piety and virtue. Thoſe who performed the office of interpreters ſtudied above all things plainneſs and perſpicuity. At the ſame time it muſt be acknowledged, that, even in this century, ſeveral Chriſtians adopted that abſurd and corrupt cuſtom, uſed among the Jews, of darkning the plain words of the holy ſcriptures by inſipid and forced allegories, and of drawing them violently from their proper and natural ſignification, in order to extort from them certain myſterious and hidden ſignifications. For a proof of this, we need go no further than the *Epiſtle of* BARNABAS, which is yet extant.

Of teaching religion.

III. The method of teaching the ſacred doctrines of religion, was, at this time, moſt ſimple, far removed from all the ſubtle rules of philoſophy, and all the precepts of human art. This appears abundantly, not only in the writings of the apoſtles, but alſo in all thoſe of the ſecond century, which have ſurvived in the ruins of time. Neither did the apoſtles, or their diſciples, ever think of collecting into a regular ſyſtem the principal doctrines of the Chriſtian religion, or of demonſtrating them in a ſcientific and geometrical order. The beautiful and candid ſimplicity of theſe early ages rendered ſuch philoſophical niceties unneceſſary, and the great ſtudy of thoſe who embraced the goſpel, was, rather to expreſs its divine influence in their diſpoſitions and actions, than to examine its doctrines with an exceſſive curioſity, or to explain them by the rules of human wiſdom.

The Apoſtles Creed.

IV. There is, indeed, extant, a brief ſummary of the principal doctrines of Chriſtianity in that *form*, which bears the name of the *Apoſtles Creed*, and which, from the fourth century downwards, was almoſt generally conſidered as a production of the apoſtles. All, however, who have the leaſt knowledge of antiquity, look upon this opinion as entirely falſe and deſtitute of all foundation [*h*]. There is much more reaſon and judgment in the opinion of thoſe, who think that this Creed was not all compoſed at once, but from ſmall beginnings was imperceptibly augmented in proportion to the growth of hereſy, and according to the exigencies and circumſtances of the church, from whence it was deſigned to baniſh the errors that daily aroſe [*i*].

---

[g] 1 Tim. iii. 9. vi. 3. Tit. i. 1.

The diſtinction between catechumens, and believers.

V. In the earlieſt times of the church, all who profeſſed firmly to believe that JESUS was the only redeemer of the world, and who, in conſequence of this profeſſion, promiſed to live in a manner conformable to the purity of his holy religion, were immediately received among the diſciples of CHRIST. This was all the preparation for *baptiſm* then required, and a more accurate inſtruction in the doctrines of Chriſtianity was to be adminiſtred to them after their receiving that ſacrament. But when Chriſtianity had acquired more conſiſtence, and churches roſe to the true God and his eternal ſon, almoſt in every nation, this cuſtom was changed for the wiſeſt and moſt ſolid reaſons. Then none were admitted to baptiſm, but ſuch as had been previouſly inſtructed in the principal points of Chriſtianity, and had alſo given ſatisfactory proofs of pious diſpoſitions, and upright intentions. Hence aroſe the diſtinction between *catechumens*, who were in a ſtate of probation, and under the inſtruction of perſons appointed for that purpoſe; and *believers*, who were conſecrated by baptiſm, and thus initiated into all the myſteries of the Chriſtian faith.

The catechumens differently inſtructed.

VI. The methods of inſtructing the *catechumens* differed according to their various capacities. Thoſe, in whom the natural force of reaſon was ſmall, were taught no more than thoſe fundamental principles and truths, which are, as it were, the baſis of Chriſtianity. Thoſe, on the contrary, whom their inſtructors judged capable of comprehending, in ſome meaſure, the whole ſyſtem of divine truth, were furniſhed with ſuperior degrees of knowledge, and nothing was concealed from them, which could have any tendency to render them firm in their profeſſion, and to aſſiſt them in arriving at Chriſtian perfection. The care of inſtructing ſuch was committed to perſons who were diſtinguiſhed by their gravity and wiſdom, and alſo by their learning and judgment. And from hence it comes, that the ancient doctors generally divide their flock into two claſſes, the one comprehending ſuch as were ſolidly and thoroughly inſtructed; the other, thoſe who were acquainted with little more than the firſt principles of religion; nor do they deny that the methods of inſtruction applied to theſe two ſorts of perſons, were extremely different.

The care of the firſt Chriſtians in the education of their youth.

VII. The Chriſtians took all poſſible care to accuſtom their children to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and to inſtruct them in the doctrines of their holy religion; and ſchools were every where erected for this purpoſe even from the very commencement of the Chriſtian church. We muſt not, however, confound the *ſchools* deſigned only for children with the *gymnaſia*, or academies of the ancient Chriſtians, erected in ſeveral large cities, in which perſons of riper years, eſpecially ſuch as aſpired to be public teachers, were inſtructed in the different branches both of human learning and of ſacred erudition. We may, undoubtedly, attribute to the apoſtles themſelves, and their injunctions to their diſciples thoſe excellent eſtabliſhments, in which the youth deſtined to the holy miniſtry received an education ſuitable to the ſolemn office they were to undertake [k]. St. JOHN erected a ſchool of this kind at *Epheſus*, and one of the ſame nature was founded by POLYCARP, at *Smyrna* [l]. But none of theſe were in greater repute than that which was eſtabliſhed at *Alexandria* [m], which was commonly called the *catechetical ſchool*, and is generally ſuppoſed to have been erected by St. MARK [n].

[*h*] See BUDDEUS's *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. i. cap. ii. § 2. p. 441; as alſo WALCHII *Introductio in Libros Symbolicos*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 87.

[*i*] This opinion is confirmed in the moſt learned and ingenious manner by Sir PETER KING, in his *Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed*. Such, however, as read this valuable work with pleaſure, and with a certain degree of prepoſſeſſion, would do well to conſider, that its learned author, upon ſeveral occaſions, has given us conjectures inſtead of proofs, and alſo that his conjectures are not always ſo happy, as juſtly to command our aſſent.

The ſecret doctrine, in what it conſiſted.

VIII. The ancient Chriſtians are ſuppoſed by many to have had a *ſecret doctrine*; and if by this be meant that they did not teach all in the ſame manner or reveal all at once, and to all indiſcriminately, the ſublime myſteries of religion, there is nothing in this that may not be fully juſtified. It would have been improper, for example, to propoſe to thoſe, who were yet to be converted to Chriſtianity, the more difficult doctrines of the goſpel, which ſurpaſs the comprehenſion of imperfect mortals. Such were, therefore, firſt inſtructed in thoſe points which are more obvious and plain, until they became capable of higher and more difficult attainments in religious knowledge. Nay more; even thoſe who were already admitted into the ſociety of Chriſtians, were, in point of inſtruction, differently dealt with according to their reſpective capacities. Thoſe who conſider the *ſecret doctrine* of this century in any other light, or give to it a greater extent than what we have here attributed to it, confound the ſuperſtitious practices of the following ages, with the ſimplicity of the diſcipline which prevailed at the time of which we write [o].

The lives and manners of the firſt Chriſtians.

IX. The lives and manners of the Chriſtians in this century are highly celebrated by moſt authors, and recommended to ſucceeding generations as unſpotted models of piety and virtue. And if theſe encomiums be confined to the greateſt part of thoſe, who embraced Chriſtianity in the infancy of the church, they are certainly diſtributed with juſtice. But many run into extremes upon this head, and eſtimating the lives and manners of all by the illuſtrious examples of ſome eminent ſaints, or the ſublime precepts and exhortations of certain pious doctors, fondly imagine that every appearance of vice and diſorder was baniſhed from the firſt Chriſtian ſocieties. The greateſt part of thoſe authors, who have written concerning the innocence and ſanctity of the primitive Chriſtians, have fallen into this agreeable error. And a groſs error indeed it is, as the ſtrongeſt teſtimonies too evidently prove.

---

[k] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[l] IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæreſ.* lib. ii. cap. xxii. p. 148. ed. Maſſuet. EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v. cap. xx. p. 188.

[(m) The Alexandrian ſchool was renowned for a ſucceſſion of learned doctors, as we find by the accounts of EUSEBIUS and St. JEROM; for, after St. MARK, PANTÆNUS, CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, ORIGEN, and many others taught in it the doctrines of the goſpel, and rendered it a famous ſeminary for Chriſtian philoſophy and religious knowledge. There were alſo at *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Cæſarea*, *Edeſſa*, and in ſeveral other places, ſchools of the ſame nature, though not all of equal reputation.]

[n] See the diſſertation of SCHMIDIUS, *De Schola Catechetica Alexandrina*; as alſo AULISIUS, *Delle Scuole Sacre*, book ii. ch. i, ii. p. 5—17. and ch. xxi. p. 92. The curious reader will find a learned account of the more famous Chriſtian ſchools in the eaſtern parts, at *Edeſſa*, *Niſibis*, and *Seleucia*, and, indeed, of the ancient ſchools in general, in ASSEMANUS's *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticanæ*, tom. iii. par. II. p. 914—919.

[o] Many learned obſervations upon the *ſecret diſcipline* have been collected by the celebrated CHRISTOPH. MATT. PFAFFIUS, in his *Diſſert. poſter. de præjudiciis Theolog.* § 13. p. 149, &c. *in Primitiis Tubingenſibus*.

Excommunication.

X. One of the circumſtances which contributed chiefly to preſerve, at leaſt, an external appearance of ſanctity in the Chriſtian church, was the right of excluding from thence, and from all participation of the ſacred rites and ordinances of the goſpel, ſuch as had been guilty of enormous tranſgreſſions, and to whom repeated exhortations to repentance and amendment had been adminiſtred in vain. This right was veſted in the church, from the earlieſt period of its exiſtence, by the apoſtles themſelves, and was exerciſed by each Chriſtian aſſembly upon its reſpective members. The rulers or doctors denounced the perſons whom they thought unworthy of the privileges of church-communion, and the people freely approving or rejecting their judgment, pronounced the deciſive ſentence. It was not, however, irrevocable; for ſuch as gave undoubted ſigns of their ſincere repentance, and declared their ſolemn reſolutions of future reformation, were re-admitted into the church, however enormous their crimes had been; but in caſe of a relapſe, their ſecond excluſion became abſolutely irreverſible [*p*].

Controverſies among Chriſtians.

XI. It will eaſily be imagined, that unity and peace could not reign long in the church, ſince it was compoſed of Jews and Gentiles, who regarded each other with the bittereſt averſion. Beſides, as the converts to Chriſtianity could not extirpate radically the prejudices which had been formed in their minds by education and confirmed by time, they brought with them into the boſom of the church more or leſs of the errors of their former religions. Thus the ſeeds of diſcord and controverſy were early ſown, and could not fail to ſpring up ſoon into animoſities and diſſenſions, which accordingly broke out and divided the church. The firſt of theſe controverſies, which was ſet on foot in the church of *Antioch*, regarded the neceſſity of obſerving the law of Moses, and its iſſue is mentioned by St. Luke in *The Acts of the Apoſtles* [*q*]. This controverſy was followed by many others, either with the Jews, who were violently attached to the worſhip of their anceſtors, or with the votaries of a wild and fanatical ſort of philoſophy, or with ſuch as miſtaking the true genius of the Chriſtian religion abuſed it monſtrouſly to the encouragement of their vices, and the indulgence of their appetites and paſſions [*r*]. St. Paul and the other apoſtles have, in ſeveral places of their writings, mentioned theſe controverſies, but with ſuch brevity, that it is difficult, at this diſtance of time, to come at the true ſtate of the queſtion in theſe various diſputes.

[*p*] See Morinus, *Comm. de Diſciplina Pœnitentiæ*, lib. ix. cap. xix. p. 670.

[*q*] Ch. xv.

[*r*] See, for an illuſtration of theſe points, Witsius's *Miſcellanea Sacra*, tom. ii. *Exercit.* xx, xxi, xxii. p. 668. As alſo Camp. Vitringa, *Obſerv. Sacra*, lib. iv. cap. ix, x, xi. p. 952.

XII. The

Controverſy about the terms of acceptance and ſalvation.

XII. The moſt weighty and important of all theſe controverſies was that, which certain Jewiſh doctors raiſed at *Rome*, and in other Chriſtian churches, concerning the means of juſtification and acceptance with God, and the method of ſalvation pointed out in the word of God. The apoſtles, wherever they exerciſed their miniſtry, had conſtantly declared all hopes of acceptance and ſalvation deluſive, except ſuch as were founded on JESUS the redeemer, and his all-ſufficient *merits*, while the Jewiſh doctors maintained the *works* of the law to be the true efficient cauſe of the ſoul's eternal ſalvation and felicity. This latter ſentiment not only led to many other errors extremely prejudicial to Chriſtianity, but was alſo injurious to the glory of the divine Saviour. For thoſe who looked upon a courſe of life conformable to the law, as a meritorious title to eternal happineſs, could not conſider CHRIST as the ſon of God, and the Saviour of mankind, but only as an eminent prophet, or a divine meſſenger ſent from above to enlighten and inſtruct a darkened world. It is not, therefore, ſurprizing, that St. PAUL took ſo much pains in his *Epiſtle to the Romans*, and in his other writings, to extirpate ſuch a pernicious and capital error.

Judaizing Chriſtians.

XIII. The controverſy that had been raiſed concerning the neceſſity of obſerving the ceremonies of the Moſaic law, was determined by the apoſtles in the wiſeſt and moſt prudent manner [s]. Their authority, however, reſpectable as it was, had not its full effect. For the prejudices, which the Jews, eſpecially thoſe who lived in *Paleſtine*, entertained in favour of the Moſaic law, and their ancient worſhip, were ſo deeply rooted in their minds, that they could not be thoroughly removed. The force of theſe prejudices was indeed ſomewhat diminiſhed after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and the ruin of the temple, but not entirely deſtroyed. And hence, as we ſhall ſee in its place, a part of the judaizing Chriſtians ſeparated themſelves from the reſt, and formed a particular ſect, diſtinguiſhed by their adherence to the law of MOSES.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper inſtituted by CHRIST.

I. THE Chriſtian religion was ſingularly commendable on account of its beautiful and divine ſimplicity, which appears from the two great and fundamental principles on which it was built, *viz. faith* and *charity*. This ſimplicity was not, however, incompatible with certain external rites, and poſitive inſtitutions, which, indeed, are neceſſary, in this imperfect ſtate, to keep alive a ſenſe of religion in the minds of men. The rites inſtituted by CHRIST himſelf were only two in number, and theſe deſigned to continue to the end of the church here below, without any variation. Theſe rites were *baptiſm* and the *holy ſupper*, which are not to be conſidered as mere ceremonies, nor yet as ſymbolic repreſentations, only, but alſo as ordinances accompanied with a ſanctifying influence upon the heart and the affections of true

---

[s] Acts xv.

Chriſtians. And we cannot help obſerving here, that ſince the divine Saviour thought fit to appoint no more than two plain inſtitutions in his church, this ſhews us that a number of ceremonies is not eſſential to his religion, and that he left it to the free and prudent choice of Chriſtians to eſtabliſh ſuch rites as the circumſtances of the times, or the exigencies of the church might require.

Rites inſtituted by the apoſtles.

II. There are ſeveral circumſtances which incline us to think that the friends and apoſtles of our bleſſed Lord, either tolerated through neceſſity, or appointed for wiſe reaſons many other external rites in various places. At the ſame time we are not to imagine that they ever conferred upon any perſon a perpetual, indelible, pontifical authority, or that they enjoined the ſame rites in all churches. We learn on the contrary, from authentic records, that the Chriſtian worſhip was, from the beginning, celebrated in a different manner in different places, and that, no doubt, by the orders, or at leaſt with the approbation of the apoſtles and their diſciples. In thoſe early times it was both wiſe and neceſſary, to ſhew, in the eſtabliſhment of outward forms of worſhip, ſome indulgence to the ancient opinions, manners, and laws of the reſpective nations to whom the goſpel was preached.

The Jewiſh rites retained in ſeveral places.

III. From hence it follows, that the opinion of thoſe who maintain that the Jewiſh rites were adopted *every where*, in the Chriſtian churches, by order of the apoſtles, or their diſciples, is deſtitute of all foundation. In thoſe Chriſtian ſocieties, which were totally or principally compoſed of Jewiſh converts, it was natural to retain as much of the Jewiſh ritual as the genius of Chriſtianity would ſuffer, and a multitude of examples teſtify that this was actually done. But that the ſame tranſlation of Jewiſh rites ſhould take place in Chriſtian churches, where there were no Jews, or a very ſmall and inconſiderable number, is utterly incredible, becauſe ſuch an event was morally impoſſible. In a word, the external forms of worſhip uſed in the times of old, muſt neceſſarily have been regulated and modified according to the character, genius, and manners of the different nations on which the light of the goſpel aroſe.

Public aſſemblies of Chriſtians.

IV. Since then there was ſuch a variety in the ritual and diſcipline of the primitive churches, it muſt be very difficult to give ſuch an account of the worſhip, manners, and inſtitutions of the ancient Chriſtians, as will agree with what was practiſed in all thoſe countries where the goſpel flouriſhed. There are, notwithſtanding, certain laws, whoſe authority and obligation were univerſal and indiſpenſable among all Chriſtians, and of theſe we ſhall here give a brief account. All Chriſtians were unanimous in ſetting apart the firſt day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour aroſe from the dead, for the ſolemn celebration of public worſhip. This pious cuſtom, which was derived from the example of the church of *Jeruſalem*, was founded upon the expreſs appointment of the apoſtles, who conſecrated that day to the ſame ſacred purpoſe, and was obſerved univerſally throughout all the Chriſtian churches, as appears from the united teſtimonies of the moſt credible writers [t].

---

[t] PHIL. JAC. HARTMANNUS, *De rebus geſtis Chriſtianorum ſub Apoſtolis*, cap. xv. p. 387. JUST. HENN. BÖHMER, *Diſſert.* i. *Juris Eccleſ. Antiqui de ſtato die Chriſtianor.* p. 20, &c.

The ſeventh day of the week was alſo obſerved as a feſtival [u], not by the Chriſtians in general, but by ſuch churches only as were principally compoſed of Jewiſh converts, nor did the other Chriſtians cenſure this cuſtom as criminal and unlawful. It appears, moreover, that all the Chriſtian churches obſerved two great anniverſary feſtivals, the one in memory of Christ's glorious reſurrection; and the other to commemorate the deſcent of the holy ghoſt upon the apoſtles [w]. To theſe we may add the days on which the bleſſed martyrs laid down their lives for the truth, which days were probably dignified with particular ſolemnities and marks of veneration from the earlieſt times.

V. The places in which the firſt Chriſtians aſſembled to celebrate divine worſhip, were, no doubt, the houſes of private perſons. But in proceſs of time it became neceſſary, that theſe ſacred aſſemblies ſhould be confined to one fixed place, in which the books, tables, and deſks, required in divine ſervice, might be conſtantly kept, and the dangers avoided, which in thoſe perilous times attended their tranſportation from one place to another. And then, probably, the places of meeting, that had formerly belonged to private perſons, became the property of the whole Chriſtian community [x]. Theſe few remarks are, in my opinion, ſufficient to determine that queſtion, which has been ſo long and ſo tediouſly debated, *viz. whether the firſt Chriſtians had churches, or not* [y]? Since if any are pleaſed to give the name of *church* to a houſe, or the part of a houſe, which, though appointed as the place of religious worſhip, was neither ſeparated from common uſe, nor conſidered as holy in the opinion of the people, it will be readily granted that the moſt ancient Chriſtians had churches.

The manner of conducting the public worſhip in theſe aſſemblies.

VI. In theſe aſſemblies the holy ſcriptures were publicly red, and for that purpoſe were divided into certain portions or leſſons. This part of divine ſervice was followed by a brief exhortation to the people, in which eloquence and art gave place to the natural and fervent expreſſion of zeal and charity. If any declared themſelves extraordinarily animated by the holy ſpirit, they were permitted to explain ſucceſſively the divine will, while the other prophets who were preſent, decided how much weight and authority was to be attributed to what they ſaid [z]. The prayers, which made a conſiderable part of the public worſhip, came in at the concluſion of theſe diſcourſes, and were repeated by the people after the biſhop or preſbyter, who preſided in the ſervice [a]. To theſe were added certain hymns, which were ſung, not by the whole aſſembly, but by perſons appointed for that purpoſe, during the celebration of the Lord's ſupper and the feaſts of charity. Such were the eſſential parts of divine worſhip, which were obſerved in all Chriſtian churches, though perhaps the method and order, in which they were performed, were not the ſame in all [b].

---

[u] Steph. Curcellæus, *Diatriba de eſu Sanguinis, Operum Theolog.* p. 958. Gab. Albaspinæus, *Obſervat. Eccleſ.* lib. i. *Obſerv.* xiii. p. 53. It is in vain, that many learned men have laboured to prove that, in *all* the primitive churches, both the firſt and laſt day of the week were obſerved as feſtivals. The churches of *Bithynia*, of which Pliny ſpeaks in his letter to Trajan, had only *one ſtated day*, for the celebration of public worſhip; and that was, undoubtedly, the firſt day of the week, or what we call the *Lord's day*.

[w] There are, it is true, learned men, who look upon it as a doubtful matter, whether or no the day of Pentecoſt was celebrated as a feſtival ſo early as the firſt century. See Bingham's *Antiquities of the Chriſtian church*, book xx. ch. vi. p. 120. But notwithſtanding this, there are many weighty reaſons for believing that feſtival as ancient as that of Eaſter, which was celebrated, as all agree, from the very firſt riſe of the church. It is alſo probable, that Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, was early diſtinguiſhed by particular honours from the other days of the week. See Jac. Godofred, *in Codicem Theodoſii*, tom. i. p. 138. Asseman. *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. 217. 237. Martene *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 66.

[x] See Camp. Vitringa, *De ſynagoga vetere*, lib. i. par. III. cap. i. p. 432.

[y] See Blondel, *De Epiſcopis et Preſbyteris*, § 3. p. 216. 243. 246. Just. Henn.

The Lord's ſupper and the feaſts of charity.

VII. The prayers of the firſt Chriſtians were followed by *oblations* of bread, wine, and other things; and hence both the miniſters of the church and the poor derived their ſubſiſtence. Every Chriſtian, who was in an opulent condition, and indeed every one, according to their circumſtances, brought with them their gifts, and offered them, as it were, unto the Lord [c]. Of the bread and wine, preſented in theſe offerings, ſuch a quantity was ſeparated from the reſt, as was required in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper; this was conſecrated by certain prayers pronounced by the biſhop alone, to which the people aſſented by ſaying *Amen* [d]. The holy ſupper was diſtributed by the *deacons*; and this ſacred inſtitution was followed by ſober repaſts, which, from the excellent end they were deſigned to promote, were called *agapæ*, or *feaſts* of charity [e]. Many attempts have been made to fix preciſely the nature of theſe ſocial feaſts. But here it muſt be again conſidered, that the rites and cuſtoms of the primitive Chriſtians were very different in different countries, and that conſequently theſe feaſts, like other inſtitutions, were not every where celebrated in the ſame manner. This is the true and only way of explaining all the difficulties that can ariſe upon this ſubject.

Baptiſm.

VIII. The ſacrament of *baptiſm* was adminiſtred in this century, without the public aſſemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpoſe, and was performed by immerſion of the whole body in the baptiſmal font [f]. At firſt it was uſual for all who laboured in the propagation of the goſpel,

---

BÖHMER, *Diſſert.* ii. *Juris Eccleſ. Antiqui, de Antelucanis Chriſtianorum Cœtibus*, § 4. p. 39. BINGHAM's *Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church*, book viii. ch. i. § 3, 4, 5, 6.

[z] 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

[a] See JUSTIN Martyr, his ſecond Apology, p. 98, &c.

[b] This muſt be underſtood of churches well eſtabliſhed, and regulated by fixed and certain laws. For in the firſt Chriſtian aſſemblies, which were yet in an imperfect and fluctuating ſtate, one or other of theſe circumſtances of divine worſhip may poſſibly have been omitted.

[c] See the diſſertations of the venerable and learned PFAFF, *De oblatione et conſecratione Euchariſtica*, which are contained in his *Syntagma Diſſertation. Theologic.* publiſhed at *Stutgard*, in 8vo in the year 1720.

[d] JUSTIN *Martyr Apologia ſecunda*, p. 98. The ſeveral authors who have written concerning the manner of celebrating the Lord's ſupper, are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar*, cap. xi. 395, &c.

[e] The authors who have written concerning the *Agapæ*, or *Feaſts of Charity*, are mentioned by ITTIGIUS, in his *Selecta Hiſtoriæ Eccleſ. Capita*, Sæc. ii. cap. iii. p. 180. and alſo by PFAFF, *De originibus Juris Eccleſ.* p. 68.

[f] See the learned diſſertation of JO. GERARD VOSSIUS concerning baptiſm, *Diſp.* i. *Theſ.* vi. p. 31, &c. The reader will alſo find in the xith chapter and xxvth Section of the *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* of the celebrated FABRICIUS, an account of the authors who have written upon this ſubject.

to be preſent at that ſolemn ceremony; and it was alſo cuſtomary, that the converts ſhould be baptized and received into the church by thoſe, under whoſe miniſtry they had embraced the Chriſtian doctrine. But this cuſtom was ſoon changed. When the Chriſtian churches were well eſtabliſhed and governed by a ſyſtem of fixed laws, then the right of baptizing the Chriſtian converts was veſted in the biſhop alone. This right, indeed, he conferred upon the *preſbyters* and *chorepiſcopi*, or *country biſhops*, when the bounds of the church were ſtill further enlarged, reſerving, however, to himſelf the *confirmation* of the baptiſm, which was adminiſtered by a preſbyter [g]. There were, doubtleſs, ſeveral circumſtantial rites and ceremonies obſerved, in the adminiſtration of this ſacrament, for the ſake of order and decency. Of theſe, however, it is not eaſy, nor, perhaps, poſſible to give a certain or ſatisfactory account; ſince upon this ſubject we are too much expoſed to the illuſion, which ariſes from confounding the cuſtoms of the primitive times with thoſe of ſucceeding ages.

The ſick anointed.

IX. Thoſe who were viſited with violent or dangerous diſorders, ſent, according to the apoſtle's direction [h], for the rulers of the church, and, after confeſſing their ſins, were recommended by them to the divine mercy in prayers full of piety and fervour, and were alſo anointed with oil. This rite has occaſioned many debates, and, indeed, they muſt be endleſs, ſince the ſilence of the ancient writers, upon that head, renders it impoſſible to decide the matter with any degree of certainty. The anointing the ſick is very rarely mentioned in the ancient records of the church, though there is no reaſon to doubt of its having been an univerſal cuſtom among Chriſtians [i].

Faſting introduced.

X. Neither CHRIST nor his apoſtles enacted any law concerning *faſting*. A cuſtom, however, prevailed among many Chriſtians of joining abſtinence with their prayers, eſpecially when they were engaged in affairs of extraordinary moment and importance [k]. As this cuſtom was authorized by no public law, the time that was to be employed in theſe acts of abſtinence was left to every one's private judgment, nor were thoſe looked upon as criminal, who contented themſelves with obſerving the rules of a ſtrict temperance, without going any further [l]. In the moſt ancient times we find no mention of any public and ſolemn faſts, except upon the anniverſary of CHRIST's crucifixion. But in proceſs of time, days of faſting were gradually introduced, firſt by cuſtom, and afterwards by poſitive appointment; though it is not certain what thoſe days were, nor whether they were obſerved in the firſt century. Thoſe, notwithſtanding, who affirm that, in the time of the apoſtles, or ſoon after, the fourth and ſixth days of the week were obſerved as faſts, are not, it muſt be acknowledged, deſtitute of ſpecious arguments in favour of their opinion [*m*].

---

[g] Theſe obſervations will illuſtrate and perhaps decide the queſtion, concerning the right of adminiſtring baptiſm, which has been ſo long debated among the learned, and with ſuch ardour and vehemence. See BÖHMER, *Diſſert.* xi. *Juris Eccleſ.* p. 500; as alſo LE CLERC *Biblioth. Univerſelle et Hiſtorique*, tom. iv. p. 93.

[h] James v. 14.

[i] The accounts which the ancient authors have given of this cuſtom, are, the moſt of them, collected in a treatiſe publiſhed by LAUNOIUS, *De ſacramentis unctionis infirmorum*, c. i. p. 444. in the firſt volume of his works. Among theſe accounts there are extremely few drawn from the writers of the firſt ages, and ſome paſſages applicable to this ſubject, have been omitted by that learned author.

[k] 1 Cor. vii. 5.

[l] See the *Shepherd of Hermas*, book iii. *Similitud.* v. p. 931. 935. edition of FABRICIUS.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the ſeditions and hereſies, which troubled the church during this century.

Sects are formed in the time of the apoſtles.

I. THE Chriſtian church was ſcarcely formed, when, in differerent places, there ſtarted up certain pretended reformers, who, not ſatisfied with the ſimplicity of that religion which was taught by the apoſtles, meditated changes of doctrine and worſhip, and ſet up a new religion drawn from their own licentious imaginations. This we learn from the writings of the apoſtles, and particularly from the epiſtles of St. PAUL, where we find that ſome were for forcing the doctrines of Chriſtianity into a conformity with the philoſophical ſyſtems they had adopted [*n*], while others were as ſtudious to blend with theſe doctrines the opinions, cuſtoms, and traditions of the Jews. Several of theſe are mentioned by the apoſtles, ſuch as HYMENÆUS, ALEXANDER, PHILETUS, HERMOGENES, DEMAS, and DIOTREPHES; though the four laſt are rather to be conſidered as apoſtates from the truth, than as corrupters of it [*o*].

And grow imperceptibly.

II. The influence of theſe new teachers was but inconſiderable at firſt. During the lives of the apoſtles, their attempts towards the perverſion of Chriſtianity were attended with little ſucceſs, and the number of their followers was exceeding ſmall. They, however, acquired credit and ſtrength by degrees; and even, from the firſt dawn of the goſpel, laid, imperceptibly, the foundations of thoſe ſects, whoſe animoſities and diſputes produced afterwards ſuch trouble and perplexity in the Chriſtian church. The true ſtate of theſe diviſions is more involved in darkneſs than any other part of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; and this obſcurity proceeds partly from the want of ancient records, partly from the abſtruſe and unintelligible nature of the doctrines that diſtinguiſhed theſe various ſects, and finally, from the ignorance and prejudices of thoſe, who have tranſmitted to us the accounts of them, which are yet extant. Of one thing indeed we are certain, and that is, that the moſt of theſe doctrines were chimerical and extravagant in the higheſt degree; and ſo far from containing any thing that could recommend them to a lover of truth, that they rather deſerve to occupy a place in the hiſtory of human deluſion and folly [*p*].

[*m*] See BEVEREGE's *Vindication of the Canon*, in the ſecond volume of his edition of the *Apoſtolic Fathers*, p. 166.

[*n*] 1 Tim. vi. 20. 1 Tim. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Col. ii. 8.

[*o*] 2 Tim. ii. 18. and in other places. See alſo the accurate acccounts given of theſe men by VITRINGA, *Obſerv. Sacr.* lib. iv. cap. ix. p. 952. ITTIGIUS, *De Hæreſiarchis ævi Apoſtol.* § 1. c. viii. p. 84. BUDDEUS, *De Eccleſia Apoſtolica*, cap. v. p. 292, &c.

The ſect of the Gnoſtics.

III. Among the various ſects that troubled the tranquillity of the Chriſtian church, the leading one was that of the Gnoſtics. Theſe enthuſiaſtic and ſelf-ſufficient philoſophers boaſted of their being able to reſtore mankind to the *knowledge (gnoſis)* of the true and ſupreme being, which had been loſt in the world. They alſo foretold the approaching defeat of the *evil principle*, to whom they attributed the creation of this globe, and declared, in the moſt pompous terms, the deſtruction of his aſſociates, and the ruin of his empire. An opinion has prevailed, derived from the authority of CLEMENS the Alexandrian, that the firſt riſe of the Gnoſtic ſect is to be dated after the death of the apoſtles, and placed under the reign of the emperor ADRIAN; and it is alſo alledged, that, before this time, the church enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, undiſturbed by diſſenſions or ſects of any kind. But the ſmalleſt degree of attention to the language of the holy ſcriptures, not to mention the authority of other ancient records, will prevent our adopting this groundleſs notion. For, from ſeveral paſſages of the ſacred writings [*q*], it evidently appears, that, even in the firſt century, the general meeting of Chriſtians was deſerted, and ſeparate aſſemblies formed in ſeveral places, by perſons infected with the Gnoſtic hereſy; though, at the ſame time, it muſt be acknowledged, that this pernicious ſect was not conſpicuous either for its number or its reputation, before the time of ADRIAN. It is proper juſt to obſerve here, that under the general appellation of Gnoſtics are comprehended all thoſe who, in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, corrupted the doctrine of the goſpel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philoſophy, (concerning the origin of evil, and the creation of the world) with its divine truths.

Sprung from the oriental philoſophy.

IV. It was from this oriental philoſophy, of which the leading principles have been already mentioned, that the Chriſtian Gnoſtics derived their origin. If it was one of the chief tenets of this philoſophy, that rational ſouls were impriſoned in corrupt matter, contrary to the will of the ſupreme deity; there were however, in this ſame ſyſtem, other doctrines which promiſed a deliverance from this deplorable ſtate of ſervitude and darkneſs. The oriental ſages expected the arrival of an extraordinary meſſenger of the moſt high upon earth; a meſſenger inveſted with a divine authority, endowed with the moſt eminent ſanctity and wiſdom, and peculiarly appointed to enlighten, with the knowledge of the ſupreme being, the darkened minds of miſerable mortals, and to deliver them from the chains of the tyrants and uſurpers of this world. When, therefore, ſome of theſe philoſophers perceived that CHRIST and his followers wrought miracles of the moſt amazing kind, and alſo of the moſt ſalutary nature to mankind, they were eaſily induced to believe that he was the great meſſenger expected from above, to deliver men from the power of the malignant *genii*, or ſpirits, to which, according to their doctrine, the world was ſubjected, and to free their ſouls from the dominion of corrupt matter. This ſuppoſition once admitted, they interpreted, or rather corrupted all the precepts and doctrines of CHRIST and his apoſtles, in ſuch a manner, as to reconcile them with their own pernicious tenets.

[*p*] Certain authors have written profeſſedly concerning the ſects that divided the church in this and the following century, ſuch as ITTIGIUS in his treatiſe, *De hæreſiarchis ævi Apoſtolici et Apoſtolico proximi*, printed at *Leipſick* in 1690, and alſo in the Appendix to the ſame work publiſhed in 1696. RENATUS MASSUET, in his *Diſſertations* prefixed to IRENÆUS, and TILLEMONT, in his *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*. But theſe authors, and others whom we ſhall not mention, have rather collected the materials, from which an hiſtory of the ancient ſects may be compoſed, than written their hiſtory. HINCKELMAN, THOMASIUS, DODWELL, HORBIUS, and BASNAGE, have ſome of them promiſed, others of them attempted, ſuch a hiſtory; but none of them have finiſhed this uſeful deſign. It is therefore to be wiſhed, that ſome eminent writer, who, with a competent knowledge of ancient philoſophy and literature is alſo poſſeſſed of a penetrating and unbiaſſed judgment, would undertake this difficult, but intereſting work.

[*q*] 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8.

Occaſions many pernicious errors concerning the ſcriptures and other matters.

V. From the falſe principle abovementioned aroſe, as it was but natural to expect, a multitude of ſentiments and notions moſt remote from the tenor of the goſpel doctrines, and the nature of its precepts. The Gnoſtic doctrine, concerning the creation of the world by one or more inferior beings of an evil, or, at leaſt, of an imperfect nature, led that ſect to deny the divine authority of the books of the Old Teſtament, whoſe accounts of the origin of things ſo palpably contradicted this idle fiction. Through a frantic averſion to theſe ſacred books, they laviſhed their encomiums upon the *ſerpent*, the firſt author of ſin, and held in veneration ſome of the moſt impious and profligate perſons, of whom mention is made in ſacred hiſtory. The pernicious influence of their fundamental principle carried them to all ſorts of extravagance, filled them with an abhorrence of MOSES and the religion he taught, and made them aſſert that in impoſing ſuch a ſyſtem of diſagreeable and ſevere laws upon the Jews, he was only actuated by the malignant author of this world, who conſulted his own glory and authority, and not the real advantage of men. Their perſuaſion that *evil* reſided in *matter*, as its center and ſource, prevented their treating the body with that regard that is due to it, rendered them unfavourable to wedlock, as the means by which corporeal beings are multiplied, and led them to reject the doctrine of the reſurrection of the body, and its future reunion with the immortal ſpirit. Their notion that malevolent *genii* preſided in nature, and that from them proceeded all diſeaſes and calamities, wars, and deſolations, induced them to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of magic, to weaken the powers, or ſuſpend the influences of theſe malignant agents. I omit the mention of ſeveral other extravagancies in their ſyſtem, the enumeration of which would be incompatible with the character of a compendious hiſtory.

Their opinions concerning CHRIST.

VI. The notions of this ſect concerning JESUS CHRIST were impious and extravagant. For, though they conſidered him as the ſon of the ſupreme God ſent from the *pleroma*, or habitation of the everlaſting father, for the happineſs of miſerable mortals; yet they entertained the moſt unworthy ideas both of his perſon and offices. They denied his deity, looking upon him as the ſon of God, and conſequently inferior to the father; and they rejected his humanity, upon the ſuppoſition that every thing concrete and corporeal is in itſelf eſſentially and intrinſically evil. From hence the greateſt part of the Gnoſtics denied that CHRIST was cloathed with a *real* body, or that he ſuffered *really*, for the ſake of mankind, the pains and ſorrows which he is ſaid to have ſuſtained, in the ſacred hiſtory. They maintained that he came to mortals with no other view, than to deprive the tyrants of this world of their influence upon virtuous and heaven-born ſouls, and, deſtroying the empire of theſe wicked ſpirits, to teach mankind, how they might ſeparate the divine mind from the impure body, and render the former worthy of being united to the father of ſpirits.

Their moral doctrines.

VII. Their doctrine relating to morals and practice was of two kinds, and thoſe extremely different from each other. The greateſt part of this ſect adopted rules of life that were full of auſterity, recommended a ſtrict and rigorous abſtinence, and preſcribed the moſt ſevere, bodily mortifications, from a notion that they had a happy influence in purifying and enlarging the mind, and in diſpoſing it for the contemplation of celeſtial things. As they looked upon it to be the unhappineſs of the ſoul to have been aſſociated, at all, to a malignant, terreſtrial body, ſo they imagined that the more that body was extenuated, the leſs it would corrupt and degrade the mind, or divert it from purſuits of a ſpiritual and divine nature; all the Gnoſtics, however, were not ſo ſevere in their moral diſcipline. Some maintained that there was no moral difference in human actions; and thus, confounding right with wrong, they gave a looſe rein to all the paſſions, and aſſerted the innocence of following blindly all their motions, and of living by their tumultuous dictates [r]. There is nothing ſurprizing or unaccountable in this difference between the Gnoſtic moraliſts. For, when we examine the matter with attention, we ſhall find that the ſame doctrine may very naturally have given riſe to theſe oppoſite ſentiments. As they all in general conſidered the body, as the center and ſource of evil, thoſe of that ſect, who were of a moroſe and auſtere diſpoſition, would be hence naturally led to mortify and combat the body as the enemy of the ſoul; and thoſe who were of a voluptuous turn might alſo conſider the actions of the body, as having no relation, either of congruity or incongruity, to the ſtate of a ſoul in communion with God.

How their doctrines were ſupported.

VIII. Such extraordinary doctrines had certainly need of an undoubted authority to ſupport them; and as this authority was not to be found in the writings of the evangeliſts or apoſtles, recourſe was had to fables and ſtratagems. When the Gnoſtics were challenged to produce the ſources from whence they had drawn ſuch ſtrange tenets, and an authority proper to juſtify the confidence with which they taught them; ſome referred to fictitious writings of Abraham, Zoroaster, Christ and his apoſtles; others boaſted of their having drawn theſe opinions from certain ſecret doctrines of Christ, which were not expoſed to vulgar eyes; others affirmed, that they had arrived to theſe ſublime degrees of wiſdom by an innate force and vigour of mind; and others aſſerted that they were inſtructed in theſe myſterious parts of theological ſcience by Theudas, a diſciple of St. Paul, and by Matthias one of the friends of our Lord. As to thoſe among the Gnoſtics, who did not utterly reject the books of the New Teſtament, it is proper to obſerve, that they not only interpreted thoſe ſacred books in the moſt abſurd manner, by neglecting the true ſpirit of the words and the intention of the writers, but alſo corrupted them, in the moſt perfidious manner, by curtailing and adding, in order to remove what was unfavourable, or to produce ſomething conformable to their pernicious and extravagant ſyſtem.

---

[r] See Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromatum* lib. iii. cap. v. p. 529. edit. Potter.

Whence the diſſenſions among this ſect.

IX. It has been already obſerved, that the Gnoſtics were divided in their opinions before they embraced Chriſtianity. This appears from the account which has been given above of the oriental philoſophy; and from hence we ſhall comprehend the reaſon, why they were formed into ſo many different ſects after their receiving the Chriſtian faith. For, as every one endeavoured to force the doctrines of the goſpel into a conformity with their particular ſentiments and tenets, ſo Chriſtianity muſt have appeared in different forms, among the different members of a ſect, which paſſed, however, under one general name. Another circumſtance which alſo contributed to the diverſity of ſects among this people, was, that ſome being Jews by birth (as CERINTHUS and others) could not ſo eaſily aſſume that contempt of MOSES, and that averſion to his hiſtory, which were ſo virulently indulged by thoſe who had no attachment to the Jewiſh nation, nor to its religious inſtitutions. We obſerve, in the laſt place, that the whole religious and philoſophical ſyſtem of the Gnoſtics was deſtitute of any ſure or ſolid foundation, and depended, both for its exiſtence and ſupport, upon the airy ſuggeſtions of genius and fancy. This conſideration alone is a ſufficient key to explain the diviſions that reigned in this ſect; ſince *uniformity* can never ſubſiſt, with aſſurance, but upon the baſis of evident, and ſubſtantial truth; and *variety* muſt naturally introduce itſelf into thoſe ſyſtems and inſtitutions, which are formed and conducted by the ſole powers of invention and fancy.

Doſitheus.

X. As then the Chriſtian religion was, in its firſt riſe, corrupted in ſeveral places by the mixture of an impious and chimerical philoſophy with its pure and ſublime doctrines, it will be proper to mention here the heads of thoſe ſects, who, in the firſt century, caſt a cloud upon the luſtre of the riſing church. Among theſe many give the firſt place to DOSITHEUS a Samaritan. It is certain, that about the time of our Saviour, a man, ſo named, lived among the Samaritans, and abandoned that ſect; but all the accounts we have of him tend to ſhew, that he is improperly placed among thoſe called *Heretics*, and ſhould rather be ranked among the enemies of Chriſtianity. For this delirious man ſet himſelf up for the MESSIAH, whom God had promiſed to the Jews, and diſowning, of conſequence, the divine miſſion of CHRIST, could not be ſaid to corrupt his doctrine [*s*].

Simon Magus not properly an heretic.

XI. The ſame obſervation holds true with reſpect to SIMON MAGUS. This impious man is not to be ranked among the number of thoſe, who, corrupted, with their errors, the purity and ſimplicity of the Chriſtian doctrine; nor is he to be conſidered as the parent and chief of the heretical tribe, in which point of light, he has been injudiciouſly viewed by almoſt all ancient and modern writers. He is rather to be placed in the number of thoſe who were enemies to the progreſs and advancement of Chriſtianity. For it is manifeſt from all the records we have concerning him, that, after his defection

[*s*] See BASNAGE *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, lib. ii. cap. xiii. RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques de Du Pin*, tom. iii. cap. xiii. p. 304.

from the Chriſtians, he retained not the leaſt attachment to CHRIST, but oppoſed himſelf openly to the divine Saviour, and aſſumed to himſelf blaſphemouſly the title of the *ſupreme power of God* [t].

His hiſtory,

XII. The accounts, which ancient writers give us of SIMON the magician, and of his opinions, ſeem ſo different, and indeed ſo inconſiſtent with each other, that certain learned men have conſidered them as regarding two different perſons, bearing the name of SIMON, the one a magician and an apoſtate from Chriſtianity; the other a Gnoſtic philoſopher. This opinion, which ſuppoſes a fact without any other proof than a ſeeming difference in the narration of the ancient hiſtorians, ought not to be too lightly adopted. To depart from the authority of ancient writers in this matter is by no means prudent, nor is it neceſſary to reconcile the different accounts already mentioned, whoſe inconſiſtency is not real, but apparent only. SIMON was, by birth, a Samaritan, or a Jew: when he had ſtudied philoſophy at *Alexandria* [u], he made a public profeſſion of magic (which was nothing very uncommon at that time) and perſuaded the Samaritans, by fictitious miracles, that he had received from God the power of commanding and reſtraining thoſe evil beings by which mankind were tormented [w]. Having ſeen the miracles which PHILIP wrought, by a divine power, he joined himſelf to this apoſtle, and embraced the doctrine of CHRIST, but with no other deſign than to receive the power of working miracles in order to promote a low intereſt, and to preſerve and encreaſe his impious authority over the minds of men. Then St. PETER pointed out to him ſolemnly the impiety of his intentions, and the vanity of his hopes, in that ſevere diſcourſe recorded in the VIII^th^ chapter of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; then the vile impoſtor, not only returned to his former ways by an entire defection from the Chriſtians, but alſo oppoſed, wherever he came, the progreſs of the goſpel, and even travelled into different countries with that odious deſign. Many things are recorded of this impoſtor, of his tragical end, and of the ſtatue erected to him at *Rome*, which the greateſt part of the learned reject as fabulous. They are at leaſt uncertain, and deſtitute of all probability [x].

and doctrines,

XIII. It is beyond all doubt, that SIMON was in the claſs of thoſe philoſophers, who not only maintained the eternity of *matter*, but alſo the exiſtence of an *evil being*, who preſided and thus ſhared the empire of the univerſe with the ſupreme and beneficent *mind*. And as there was a good deal of variety in the ſentiments of the different members of this ſect, it is more than probable that SIMON embraced the opinion of thoſe who held that matter, moved, from eternity, by an intrinſic and neceſſary activity, had by its innate force produced, at a certain period of time, from its own ſubſtance, the *evil principle* which now exerciſes dominion over it, with all his numerous train of attendants. From this pernicious doctrine, the other errors attributed to him concerning *fate*, *the indifference of human actions*, *the impurity of the human body*, *the power of magic*, and ſuch like extravagancies, flow naturally as from their true and genuine ſource [y]. But this odious magician ſtill proceeded to more ſhocking degrees of enormity in his monſtrous fictions; for he pretended, that in his perſon reſided the greateſt and moſt powerful of the divine *æons*; that another *æon* of the female ſex, the mother of all human ſouls, dwelt in the perſon of his miſtreſs HELENA [z], and that he came, by the command of God, upon earth to aboliſh the empire of thoſe that had formed this material world, and to deliver HELENA from their power and dominion.

---

[t] *Origen. adv. Celſum.* lib. v. p. 272. edit. Spenceri.

[u] *Clementina Homil.* ii. p. 633. tom. ii. *PP. Apoſt.*

[w] Acts viii. 9, 10.

[x] See BEAUSOBRE *Hiſtoire de Manich.* p. 203, 395. VAN DALE's diſſertation, *De Statua Simonis*, ſubjoined to his diſcourſe concerning the ancient oracles. DEYLINGIUS *Obſervat. Sacr.* lib. i. *Obſerv.* xxxvi. p. 140. TILLEMONT, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 340. [The circumſtances of SIMON's tragical end, *viz.* His having pretended to fly by a miraculous power in order to pleaſe the emperor NERO, who was fond of magic; his falling to the ground and breaking his limbs in conſequence of the prayers of St. PETER and St. PAUL; and his putting himſelf to death, through ſhame and deſpair, to have been thus defeated by the ſuperior power of the apoſtles: all theſe romantic fictions have derived their credit from a ſet of eccleſiaſtical writers, who, on many occaſions, prefer the *marvellous* to the *truth*, as favourable to a ſyſtem of religion, or rather ſuperſtition, which truth and reaſon loudly diſown.]

Menander.

XIV. Another wrong-headed teacher, named MENANDER, a Samaritan alſo by birth, appeared in this century. He is ſaid to have been inſtructed by SIMON; though this opinion has no other foundation, than the general notion that all the various ſects of the Gnoſtics derived their origin from that magician, and this notion is entirely groundleſs. Be that as it will, MENANDER ſhould rather be ranked with the lunatics than with the heretics of antiquity, ſeeing he alſo took it into his head to exhibit himſelf to the world as the promiſed Saviour. For it appears by the teſtimonies of IRENÆUS, JUSTIN, and TERTULLIAN, that he pretended to be one of the *æons* ſent from the *pleroma*, or celeſtial regions, to ſuccour the ſouls that lay groaning under bodily oppreſſion and ſervitude, and to maintain them againſt the violence and ſtratagems of the *demons* that hold the reins of empire in this ſublunary world. As this doctrine was built upon the ſame foundation with that of SIMON MAGUS, therefore the ancient writers looked upon him as the inſtructor of MENANDER.

Nicolaitans.

XV. If then we ſeparate theſe three perſons, now ſucceſſively mentioned, from the heretics of the firſt century, we may rank among the chief of the Chriſtian ſectaries, and particularly of thoſe that bear the general name of Gnoſtics, the Nicolaitans, whom CHRIST himſelf mentions, with abhorrence, by the mouth of his apoſtle [a]. It is true, indeed, that the divine Saviour does not reproach them with erroneous opinions concerning the deity, but with the licentiouſneſs of their practice, and the contempt of that ſolemn law which the apoſtles had enacted (Acts xv. 29.) againſt fornication, and the uſe of *meats* offered to idols. It is however certain, that the writers of the ſecond and the following centuries, IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, CLEMENS, and others, affirm, that the Nicolaitans adopted the ſentiments of the Gnoſtics, concerning the *two principles* of all things, the *æons*, and the origin of this terreſtrial globe. The authority of theſe writers would be entirely ſatisfactory in this matter, were there not ſome reaſon to imagine, that they confounded, in their narrations, two ſects very different from each other, that of the Nicolaitans mentioned in the Revelations; and another founded, by a certain NICOLAUS, in the ſecond century, upon the principles of the Gnoſtics. But this is a matter of two doubtful a nature to juſtify a poſitive deciſion on either ſide.

---

[y] The diſſertation of HORBIUS, concerning SIMON the magician, which was publiſhed not long ago, in the *Biblioth. Hæreſiologica* of VOIGTIUS, tom. i. par. III. p. 511. ſeems preferable to any thing elſe upon that ſubject, though it be a juvenile performance, and not ſufficiently finiſhed. He follows the ſteps of his maſter THOMASIUS, who, with admirable penetration, diſcovered the true ſource of that multitude of errors, with which the Gnoſtics, and particularly SIMON, were ſo diſmally polluted. VOIGTIUS, in the place above cited, p. 567. gives a liſt of the other authors, who have made any mention of this impoſtor.

[z] Some very learned men have given an allegorical explication of what the ancient writers ſay concerning HELENA the miſtreſs of this magician, and imagine that by the name HELENA is ſignified either *matter*, or *ſpirit*. But nothing is more eaſy than to ſhew upon what ſlight foundations this opinion is built.

[a] Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15.

Cerinthus and the Cerinthians.

XVI. There is no ſort of doubt, but that CERINTHUS may be placed with propriety among the Gnoſtics, though the learned are not entirely agreed whether he belongs to the heretics of the firſt or the ſecond century [b]. This man was by birth a Jew, and having applied himſelf to letters and philoſophy at *Alexandria* [c], attempted, at length, to form a new and ſingular ſyſtem of doctrine and diſcipline by a monſtrous combination of the doctrines of CHRIST, with the opinions and errors of the Jews and Gnoſtics. From the latter he borrowed their *pleroma*, their *æons*, their *demiurge*, &c. and ſo modified and tempered theſe fictions, as to give them an air of Judaiſm, which muſt have conſiderably favoured the progreſs of his hereſy. He taught "that the "creator of this world, whom he conſidered alſo as the ſovereign and law-"giver of the Jewiſh people, was a *being* endowed with the greateſt virtues, "and derived his birth from the *Supreme God*; that this *being* fell, by degrees, "from his native virtue, and his primitive dignity; that the *Supreme God*, in "conſequence of this, determined to deſtroy his empire, and ſent upon earth, "for this purpoſe, one of the ever-happy and glorious *æons*, whoſe name was "CHRIST; that this CHRIST choſe for his habitation the perſon of JESUS, a "man of the moſt illuſtrious ſanctity and juſtice, the ſon of JOSEPH and "MARY, and deſcending in the form of a *dove* entered into him, while he was "receiving the baptiſm of JOHN in the waters of *Jordan*; that JESUS, after "his union with CHRIST, oppoſed himſelf with vigour to the *God of the Jews*, "and was, by his inſtigation, ſeized and crucified by the Hebrew chiefs; "that when JESUS was taken captive, CHRIST aſcended up on high, ſo that "the man JESUS alone was ſubjected to the pains of an ignominious death." CERINTHUS required of his followers, that they ſhould worſhip the father of CHRIST, even the Supreme God, in conjunction with the ſon; that they ſhould abandon the law-giver of the Jews, whom he looked upon as the creator of the world; that they ſhould retain a part of the law given by

---

[b] See SAM. BASNAGE, *Annal. Polit. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 6. FAYDIT, *Eclairciſſemens ſur l'Hiſtoire Eccleſ. de deux premiers Siecles*, cap. v. p. 64. The opinions of theſe two learned men is oppoſed by BUDDEUS, *De Eccleſ. Apoſtolica*, cap. v. p. 412.

[c] THEODORET. *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 219. tom. iii. *Opp.*

MOSES, but ſhould, nevertheleſs, employ their principal attention and care to regulate their lives by the precepts of CHRIST. To encourage them to this, he promiſed them the reſurrection of this mortal body, after which was to commence a ſcene of the moſt exquiſite delights, during CHRIST's earthly reign of a thouſand years, which was to be ſucceeded by an happy and never ending life in the celeſtial world. For CERINTHUS held, that CHRIST will one day return upon earth, and, renewing his former union with the man JESUS, will reign with his people in the land of *Paleſtine* during a thouſand years.

The Nazarenes and Ebionites properly belong to the ſecond century.

XVII. It has been already obſerved, that the church was troubled with early diſputes concerning the law of MOSES and the Jewiſh rites. Thoſe, however, who conſidered the obſervance of the Moſaic rites as neceſſary to ſalvation, had not, in this firſt century, proceeded ſo far as to break off all communion with ſuch as differed from them in this matter. Therefore they were ſtill regarded as brethren, though of the weaker ſort. But when, after the ſecond deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, under the emperor ADRIAN, theſe zealots for the Jewiſh rites deſerted the ordinary aſſemblies of Chriſtians, and eſtabliſhed ſeparate meetings among themſelves, then they were numbered with thoſe ſects who had departed from the pure doctrine of CHRIST. Hence the name Nazarenes and Ebionites, by which the judaizing Chriſtians were diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who looked upon the Moſaic worſhip and ceremonies, as entirely aboliſhed by the appearance of CHRIST upon earth. We ſhall only obſerve further under this head, that though the Nazarenes and Ebionites are generally placed among the ſects of the apoſtolic age, yet they really belong to the ſecond century, which was the earlieſt period of their exiſtence as a ſect.

THE SECOND CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

The ſtate of the republic.

I. IN this century the Roman ſcepter was, for the moſt part, ſwayed by princes of a mild and moderate turn. TRAJAN, though too eagerly bent upon the purſuit of glory, and not always ſufficiently attentive to his conduct, nor prudent in his meaſures, was, nevertheleſs, endowed with many virtues, and the predominant lines of his character were clemency and benevolence. ADRIAN was of a more harſh and untractable temper; yet very far from deſerving the reputation of a wicked or unjuſt prince. He was of a mixed character, chargeable with ſeveral vices, and eſtimable on account of many excellent qualities. The ANTONINES were illuſtrious models of humanity, goodneſs, and ſublime virtue. SEVERUS himſelf, in whoſe character and diſpoſitions ſuch an unexpected and diſadvantageous change was effected, was, in the beginning of his reign, unjuſt towards none, and even the Chriſtians were treated by him with equity and mildneſs.

The progreſs of Chriſtianity in the Roman empire.

II. This lenity of the emperors was ſingularly advantageous to thoſe Chriſtians who lived under the Roman ſcepter; it ſuſpended ſometimes their ſufferings, and alleviated the burthen of their diſtreſſes. For, though edicts of a ſevere nature were iſſued out againſt them, and the magiſtrates, animated by the prieſts and by the multitude, ſhed their blood with a cruelty which frequently exceeded even the dictates of the moſt barbarous laws; yet there was always ſome remedy that accompanied theſe evils, and ſoftened their ſeverity. TRAJAN, however condemnable, in other reſpects, on account of his conduct towards the Chriſtians, was yet engaged, by the repreſentations that PLINY the younger gave of them, to forbid all *ſearch to be made after them.* He alſo prohibited all anonymous libels and accuſations, by which the Chriſtians had ſo often been perfidiouſly expoſed to the greateſt ſufferings [a].

---

[a] See PLINY's epiſtles, book x. let. xcviii.

ANTONINUS PIUS went ſo far as to enact penal laws againſt their accuſers [b]. And others, by various acts of beneficence and compaſſion, defended them from the injurious treatment of the prieſts and people. Hence it came to paſs, that in this century the limits of the church were conſiderably enlarged, and the number of converts to Chriſtianity prodigiouſly augmented. Of the truth of this, we have the moſt reſpectable and authentic teſtimonies in the writings of the ancients; teſtimonies, whoſe evidence and authority are every way ſuperior to the vain attempts which ſome have made to obſcure and weaken them [c].

What countries were enlightened with the goſpel.

III. It is not eaſy to point out particularly the different countries on which the light of celeſtial truth firſt roſe in this age. The ancient records that yet remain don't give us information ſufficient to determine that matter with certainty, nor is it, indeed, a matter of much importance. We are, however, aſſured by the moſt unexceptionable teſtimonies, that CHRIST was worſhiped as God, almoſt throughout the whole eaſt, as alſo among the Germans, Spaniards, Celts, Britons, and many other nations [d]; but which of them received the goſpel in the firſt century, and which in the ſecond, is a queſtion, unanſwerable at this diſtance of time. PANTÆNUS, the head of the Alexandrian ſchool, is ſaid to have conveyed to the Indians the knowledge of CHRIST [e]. But, after an attentive examination of the account which EUSEBIUS gives of this matter, it will appear, that theſe Indians were certain Jews, inhabitants of the *Happy Arabia*, whom BARTHOLOMEW the apoſtle had before inſtructed in the doctrines of Chriſtianity. For, according to the account of St. JEROM, PANTÆNUS found among this people the goſpel of St. MATTHEW, which they had received from BARTHOLOMEW their firſt teacher.

The converſion of the Germans.

IV. The Chriſtian religion, having penetrated among the Gauls, ſeems to have paſſed from thence into that part of Germany which was ſubject to the Romans, and from thence into Britain [f]. Certain German churches, indeed, are fondly ambitious of deriving their origin from St. PETER, and from the companions of the other apoſtles. The Britons alſo are willing to believe, upon the authority of BEDE, that, in this century, and under the reign of MARCUS ANTONINUS, their king LUCIUS addreſſed himſelf to ELEUTHERUS the Roman Pontif, for doctors to inſtruct him in the Chriſtian religion, and having obtained his requeſt, embraced the goſpel [*g*]. But, after all, theſe traditions are extremely doubtful, and are, indeed, rejected by ſuch as have learning ſufficient to weigh the credibility of ancient narrations.

---

[b] EUSEBIUS *Eccl. Hiſtor.* lib. iv. cap. xiii. p. 126.

[c] See MOYLE's letters concerning the thundering legion, with the remarks which Dr. MOSHEIM has annexed to his Latin tranſlation of them, publiſhed at the end of a work, entitled, *Syntagma Diſſert. ad Sanctiores Diſciplinas pertinent.* See alſo the dialogue between JUSTIN Martyr and TRYPHO the Jew, p. 341.

[d] IRENÆUS *Contr. Hereſ.* lib. i. cap. x. TERTULLIAN *Adv. Judæos*, cap. vii. p. 212.

[e] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* book v. c. x. JEROME *Catal. Scriptor. Eccleſ.* c. xxxvi.

[f] URSINUS, BEBELIUS, and others have written learnedly concerning the origin of the German churches, which TERTULLIAN and IRENÆUS mention as erected in this century. Add to theſe, the ample illuſtrations of this ſubject, which are to be found in LIRON's *Singularités Hiſtor. et Litter.* tom. iv. p. 193. The celebrated DOM. CALMET has judiciouſly refuted the common and popular accounts of the firſt Chriſtian doctors in Germany, in his *Hiſt. de la Lorraine*, tom. i. *Diſſ. ſur les Evêques de Treves*, par. III, IV. See alſo BOLLANDUS *Act. Sanctor*, p. 922. HONTHEIM *Diſſ. de Æra Epiſcop. Trevir.* tom. i. *Hiſt. Trevir.*

Converſion of the Gauls.

V. It is very poſſible that the light of Chriſtianity may have reached *Tranſalpine Gaul*, now called *France*, before the concluſion of the apoſtolic age, either by the miniſtry of the apoſtles themſelves, or their immediate ſucceſſors. But we have no records, that mention, with certainty, the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtian churches in this part of *Europe* before the ſecond century. POTHINUS, a man of exemplary piety and zeal, ſet out from *Aſia* in company with IRENÆUS and others, and laboured in the Chriſtian cauſe with ſuch ſucceſs among the Gauls, that churches were eſtabliſhed at *Lyons* and *Vienne*, of which POTHINUS himſelf was the firſt biſhop [*h*].

Tranſlations of the New Teſtament.

VI. The writers of this century attribute this rapid progreſs of Chriſtianity to the power of God, to the energy of divine truth, to the extraordinary gifts, which were imparted to the firſt Chriſtians, and the miracles and prodigies that were wrought in their behalf and at their command; nor do they aſcribe almoſt any part of the amazing ſucceſs, that attended the preaching of the goſpel to the intervening ſuccours of human means, or ſecond cauſes. But this is carrying the matter too far. The wiſdom of human counſels, and the uſeful efforts of learning and prudence are too inconſiderately excluded from this account of things. For it is beyond all doubt, that the pious diligence and zeal, with which many learned and worthy men recommended the ſacred writings, and ſpred them abroad in tranſlations, which rendered them uſeful to thoſe who were ignorant of the language in which they were written, contributed much to the ſucceſs and propagation of the Chriſtian doctrine. Latin verſions of theſe ſacred books were multiplied by the pious labours of the learned with particular diligence, becauſe that language was now more univerſal than any other [*i*]. Among theſe verſions, that which was diſtinguiſhed by the name of the Italic obtained univerſally the preference, and was followed by the Syriac, Egyptian, and Æthiopic verſions, whoſe dates it is impoſſible to fix with certainty [*k*].

Chriſtians defended, and heretics refuted.

VII. Among the obſtacles that retarded the progreſs of Chriſtianity, the impious calumnies of its enemies were the moſt conſiderable. The perſons, the characters, and religious ſentiments of the firſt Chriſtians were moſt unjuſtly treated, and moſt perfidiouſly miſrepreſented to the credulous multitude [*l*], who were reſtrained by this only from embracing the goſpel. Thoſe therefore, who by their *apologetic* writings in favour of the Chriſtians, deſtroyed the poiſonous influence of detraction, rendered, no doubt, ſignal ſervice to the doctrine of CHRIST, by removing the chief impediment that retarded its progreſs. Nor were the writings of ſuch as combated with ſucceſs the ancient Heretics without their uſe, eſpecially in the early periods of the church. For the inſipid and extravagant doctrines of theſe ſectaries, and the groſs immoralities with which they were chargeable, were extremely prejudicial to the Chriſtian religion, by diſguſting many at whatever carried the Chriſtian name. But when it was known, by the writings of thoſe who defended Chriſtianity, that theſe corrupt heretics were held in averſion, inſtead of being patronized by the true followers of CHRIST, then, the clouds that were caſt over the religion of JESUS were diſperſed, and the prejudices that had been raiſed againſt it were fully removed.

[*g*] See USHER *Antiq. Eccleſ. Britann.* cap. i. p. 7; as alſo GODWIN, *De converſione Britann.* cap. i. p. 7. and RAPIN's *Hiſtory of England*.

[*h*] See the epiſtle of PETRUS DE MARCA, concerning the firſt riſe of Chriſtianity in *France*, publiſhed among the diſſertations of that author; and alſo by VALESIUS, in his edition of EUSEBIUS's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*. See alſo *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France*, tom. i. p. 223. LIRON's *Singularités Hiſtor. et Literaires*, vol. iv.

[*i*] See AUGUSTIN. *De doctrina Chriſtiana*, lib ii. cap. xi. p. 85. edit. Calixt.

[*k*] See Jo. GOTTLOB. CARPZOV. *Critica ſacra Vet. Teſt.* p. 663.

[*l*] Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the Heathens employed in expreſſing their hatred againſt the Chriſtians, who were called by them *atheiſts*, becauſe they derided the heathen polytheiſm; *magicians*, becauſe they wrought miracles; *ſelf-murderers*, becauſe they ſuffered martyrdom chearfully for the truth;

Miracles and extraordinary gifts.

VIII. It is eaſier to conceive than to expreſs, how much, the *miraculous powers* and *extraordinary gifts*, which were diſplayed in the miniſtry of the firſt heralds of the goſpel, contributed to enlarge the bounds of the church. Theſe gifts, however, which were given for wiſe and important reaſons, began gradually to diminiſh in proportion, as the reaſons ceaſed for which they were conferred. And accordingly when almoſt all nations were enlightened with the truth, and the number of Chriſtian churches increaſed daily in all places, then the miraculous gift of tongues began gradually to decreaſe. It appears, at the ſame time, from unexceptionable teſtimonies, that the other extraordinary gifts with which the omnipotence and wiſdom of the Moſt High had ſo richly endowed the riſing church, were, in ſeveral places, continued during this century [m].

The miracle of the thundering legion.

IX. We cannot indeed place, with any degree of certainty, among the effects of a miraculous power yet remaining in the church, the ſtory of the *Chriſtian legion*, who, by their prayers, drew from heaven a refreſhing ſhower upon the army of MARCUS ANTONINUS, ready to periſh with thirſt, when that emperor was at war with the Marcomanni. This remarkable event (which gave to the Chriſtians to whom it was attributed the name of the *thundering legion*, on account of the thunder and lightning that deſtroyed the enemy, while the ſhower revived the fainting Romans) has been mentioned by many writers. But whether it was really miraculous or not, has been much diſputed among learned men. Some think that the Chriſtians, by a pious ſort of miſtake, attributed this unexpected and ſeaſonable ſhower, which ſaved the Roman army, to a miraculous interpoſition; and this opinion is indeed ſupported by the weightieſt reaſons, as well as by the moſt reſpectable authorities [n].

---

haters of the light, becauſe, to avoid the fury of the perſecutions raiſed againſt them, they were forced, at firſt, to hold their religious aſſemblies in the night: with a multitude of other ignominious epithets employed againſt them by TACITUS, SUETONIUS, CELSUS, *&c.* See BINGHAM's *Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church*, book i. cap. ii. p. 5.]

[m] PFANNER, *De donis miraculoſis.* SPENCER, *Not. ad Orig. contra Celſum*, p. 5, 6. MAMMACHIUS, *Originum et Antiquitat. Chriſtianar.* tom. i. p. 363, &c.

[n] Such readers, as are deſirous to know what learned men have alleged on both ſides of this curious queſtion, may conſult WITSIUS's *Diſſertat. de legione Fulminatrice*, which is ſub-

X. Let

More than dubious.

X. Let us diſtinguiſh what is doubtful in this ſtory, from that which is certain. It is certain, that the Roman army encloſed by the enemy, and reduced to the moſt deplorable and even deſperate condition by the thirſt under which they languiſhed in a parched deſart, was revived by a ſudden and unexpected rain. It is alſo certain, that both the Heathens and the Chriſtians looked upon this event as extraordinary and miraculous; the former attributing it to JUPITER, MERCURY, or the power of magic; the latter to CHRIST, interpoſing, thus unexpectedly, in conſequence of their prayers. It is ſtill further beyond all doubt, that a conſiderable number of Chriſtians ſerved, at this time, in the Roman army, and it is extremely probable, that in ſuch trying circumſtances of calamity and diſtreſs, they implored the merciful interpoſition and ſuccours of their God and Saviour. And as the Chriſtians of theſe times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and attributed to their prayers all the uncommon and ſingular occurrences of an advantageous nature that happened to the Roman empire, it will not appear ſurprizing, that, upon the preſent occaſion, they aſcribed the deliverance of ANTONINUS and his army to a miraculous interpoſition which they had obtained from above. But, on the other hand, it muſt be carefully obſerved, that it is an invariable maxim univerſally adopted by the wiſe and judicious, that no events are to be eſteemed miraculous, which may be rationally attributed to natural cauſes, and accounted for, by a recourſe to the ordinary diſpenſations of providence; and as the unexpected ſhower, which reſtored the expiring force of the Romans, may be eaſily explained without riſing beyond the uſual and ordinary courſe of nature, the concluſion is manifeſt; nor can it be doubtful in what light we are to conſider that remarkable event.

Sedition and ſlaughter of the Jews.

XI. The Jews were viſited with new calamities, firſt under TRAJAN, and then under ADRIAN, when under the ſtandards of BARCOCHEBA, who gave himſelf out for the MESSIAH, they roſe in rebellion againſt the Romans. In conſequence of this ſedition, prodigious numbers of that miſerable people were put to the ſword, and a new city, called *Ælia Capitolina*, was raiſed upon the ruins of *Jeruſalem*, into which no Jew was permitted to enter [o]. This defeat of the Jews tended to confirm, in ſome meaſure, the external tranquillity of the Chriſtian church. For that turbulent and perfidious nation had hitherto oppreſſed and vexed the Chriſtians, not only by preſenting every where to the Roman magiſtrates complaints and accuſations againſt them, but alſo by treating them in the moſt injurious manner in *Paleſtine*, and the neighbouring countries, becauſe they refuſed to ſuccour them againſt the Romans. But this new calamity, which fell upon that ſeditious nation, put

---

joined to his *Ægyptiaca*, in defence of this miracle; as alſo what is alleged againſt it by DAN. LAUROQUE, in a diſcourſe upon that ſubject, ſubjoined to the *Adverſaria Sacra* of MATTH. LARROQUE his father. But above all, the controverſy between Sir PETER KING and Mr. WALTER MOYLE upon this ſubject, is worthy of the attention of the curious; and likewiſe the diſſertation of the learned JABLOUSKI, inſerted in the eighth volume of the *Miſcellanea Leipſienſia*, p. 417. under the title of *Spicilegium de Legione Fulminatrice*. This laſt mentioned author inveſtigates, with great acuteneſs, the reaſons and motives which induced the Chriſtians to place ſo inconſiderately this *ſhower* in the liſt of miracles.

[o] JUSTIN. Mart. *Dial. cum* TRYPHONE, p. 49. 278.

it out of their power to exerciſe their malignity againſt the diſciples of JESUS, as they had formerly done.

Philoſophers converted to Chriſtianity.

XII. Among other acceſſions to the ſplendor and force of the growing church, we may reckon the learned and ingenious labours of thoſe philoſophers and Literati, who were converted to Chriſtianity in this century. I am ſenſible that the advantages ariſing from hence to the cauſe of true religion will be diſputed by many; and, indeed, when the queſtion is thus propoſed, whether, upon the whole, the intereſts of Chriſtianity have gained or loſt by the writings of the learned, and the ſpeculations of philoſophers, that have been employed in its defence, I confeſs myſelf incapable of ſolving it in a ſatisfactory manner. For nothing is more manifeſt, than this truth, that the noble ſimplicity and dignity of religion were ſadly corrupted in many places, when the philoſophers blended their opinions with its pure doctrines, and were audacious enough to ſubmit that divine ſyſtem of faith and piety to be ſcrutinized and modified by the fallible rule of imperfect reaſon.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events which happened to the church in this century.

The perſecution under Trajan.

I. IN the beginning of this century, there were no laws in force againſt the Chriſtians, for the ſenate had annulled the cruel edicts of NERO, and NERVA had abrogated the ſanguinary laws of his predeceſſor DOMITIAN. But, notwithſtanding this, a horrid cuſtom prevailed of perſecuting the Chriſtians, and even of putting them to death as often as a bloody prieſthood, or an outrageous populace, ſet on by them, demanded their deſtruction. Hence it happened, that, even under the reign of the good TRAJAN, popular tumults and ſeditions [p] were raiſed among the Chriſtians, many of whom fell victims to the rage of a mercileſs multitude. Such were the riotous proceedings that happened in *Bithynia*, under the adminiſtration of PLINY the younger, who, upon that occaſion, wrote to the emperor to know in what manner he was to conduct himſelf towards the Chriſtians. The anſwer which he received from TRAJAN amounted to this, "That the Chriſtians were not " to be *officiouſly ſought after* [q], but that ſuch as were *accuſed* and *convicted of* " *an adherence to Chriſtianity* were to be put to death, as wicked citizens, if " they did not return to the religion of their anceſtors."

The effects of Trajan's order to Pliny.

II. This edict of TRAJAN, being regiſtred among the public and ſolemn laws of the Roman empire, ſet bounds, indeed, to the fury of thoſe that perſecuted the Chriſtians, but was, however, the occaſion of martyrdom to many even under the beſt emperors. For, as often as an accuſer appeared, and the perſon accuſed of an adherence to Chriſtianity confeſſed the truth of the charge, the only alternative then, was apoſtaſy or death, ſince a magnanimous perſeverance in the Chriſtian faith, was, according to the edict of TRAJAN, a capital crime. And, accordingly, the venerable and aged SIMEON, ſon of CLEOPAS, and biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, was, by this very law crucified in conſequence of an accuſation formed againſt him by the Jews [r]. By the ſame law alſo was the great and pious IGNATIUS, biſhop of *Antioch*, ordered by TRAJAN himſelf to expire in the Roman theatre, expoſed to the rapacity of furious beaſts [s]; for as the law denounced ſimply death to ſuch as were convicted of an attachment to CHRIST, the kind of puniſhment was left by the legiſlator to the choice of the judge.

---

[p] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 103.

[q] See PLINY's letters, book x. lett. xcvii and xcviii. which have been illuſtrated by many learned men, ſuch as VOSSIUS, BÖHMER, BALDWIN, HEUMAN, and others.

Perſecution under Adrian.

III. Such of the Chriſtians as could conceal their profeſſion were indeed ſheltered under the law of TRAJAN, which was, therefore, a diſagreeable reſtraint upon the heathen prieſts, who breathed nothing but fury againſt the diſciples of JESUS. The office of an accuſer was alſo become dangerous, and very few were diſpoſed to undertake it, ſo that the ſacerdotal craft was now inventing new methods to oppreſs the Chriſtians. The law of TRAJAN was, therefore, artfully evaded under the reign of his ſucceſſor ADRIAN. The populace, ſet in motion by their prieſts, demanded of their magiſtrates, with one voice, during the public games, the deſtruction of the Chriſtians: and the magiſtrates fearing that a ſedition might be the conſequence of deſpiſing or oppoſing theſe popular clamours, were too much diſpoſed to indulge them in their requeſt. During theſe commotions SERENUS GRANIANUS, proconſul of *Aſia*, repreſented to the emperor how barbarous and unjuſt it was to ſacrifice to the fury of a lawleſs multitude perſons who had been convicted of no crime. Nor was his wiſe and equitable remonſtrance without effect; for ADRIAN, by an edict, iſſued out to theſe magiſtrates, prohibited the putting the Chriſtians to death, unleſs they were regularly accuſed and convicted of crimes committed againſt the laws; and this edict appears to have been a ſolemn renewal of the law of TRAJAN [t]. The moderation of the emperor, in this edict, may, perhaps, have been owing to the admirable *apologies* of QUADRATUS and ARISTIDES, in favour of the Chriſtians, which were every way proper to diſpel the angry prejudices of a mind that had any ſenſe of equity and humanity left. But it was not from the Romans alone, that the diſciples of CHRIST were to feel oppreſſion: BARCOCHEBAS, the fictitious king of the Jews, whom ADRIAN afterwards defeated, vented againſt them all his fury, becauſe they refuſed to join his ſtandards, and ſecond his rebellion [u].

The perſecution under Antoninus Pius.

IV. The law of ADRIAN, according to its natural ſenſe, ſeemed to cover the Chriſtians from the fury of their enemies, ſince it rendered them puniſhable on no other account than the *commiſſion of crimes*, and ſince the magiſtrates refuſed to interpret their religion as the *crime* mentioned in the imperial edict. Therefore their enemies, invented a new method of attacking them, under the reign of ANTONINUS PIUS, even by accuſing them of impiety and atheiſm. This calumny was refuted in an *apology* for the Chriſtians, preſented to the emperor by JUSTIN martyr, in conſequence of which this equitable prince ordered that all proceedings againſt them ſhould be regulated by the law of ADRIAN [w]. This, however, was not ſufficient to ſuppreſs the rage of blood-thirſty perſecution; for ſometime after this, on occaſion of ſome earth-quakes which happened in *Aſia*, the people renewed their violence againſt the Chriſtians, whom they conſidered as the authors of thoſe calamities, and treated conſequently in the moſt cruel and injurious manner. The emperor, informed of theſe unjuſt and barbarous proceedings, addreſſed an edict to the whole province of *Aſia*, in which he denounced capital puniſhment againſt ſuch as ſhould, for the future, accuſe the Chriſtians, without being able to prove them guilty of any crime [x].

---

[r] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 103.

[s] See the *Acta Martyrii Ignatiani*, publiſhed by RUINART, and alſo in the collection of the *Apoſtolic Fathers*.

[t] Compare EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. ix. with BALDUINUS *ad Edicta Princip. in Chriſtianos*, p. 73.

[u] JUSTIN Mart. *Apologia ſecunda*, p. 72. edit. Colon.

The perſecution under Marcus Antoninus.

V. This worthy prince was ſucceeded by MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS the philoſopher, whom moſt writers have celebrated beyond meaſure on account of his extraordinary wiſdom and virtue. It is not, however, in his conduct towards the Chriſtians, that we muſt look for the reaſons of theſe pompous encomiums, for here, the clemency and juſtice of that emperor ſuffer a ſtrange eclipſe. He did not, indeed, revoke the edict of ANTONINUS PIUS, or abrogate the laws which the preceding emperors had enacted in favour of the Chriſtians; but he did what was equally pernicious to them. Without examining impartially their cauſe, he lent an eaſy and attentive ear to all the moſt virulent inſinuations of their enemies, and more eſpecially to the malignant calumnies of the philoſophers, who accuſed them of the moſt horrid crimes and the moſt monſtrous impiety, and charged them with renewing the ſhocking feaſts of Thyeſtes, and the inceſtuous amours of the Theban prince. So that if we except that of NERO, there was no reign under which the Chiſtians were more injuriouſly and cruelly treated, than under that of the wiſe and virtuous MARCUS AURELIUS; and yet there was no reign under which ſuch numerous and victorious *apologies* were publiſhed in their behalf. Thoſe which JUSTIN Martyr, ATHENAGORAS, and TATIAN drew up upon this occaſion are ſtill extant.

The calamities ſuffered by the Chriſtians under him.

VI. This emperor iſſued out againſt the Chriſtians, whom he regarded as a vain, obſtinate, and vicious ſet of men, edicts [y], which, upon the whole, were very unjuſt; though we don't know, at this diſtance of time, their particular contents. In conſequence of theſe imperial edicts, the judges and magiſtrates received the accuſations, which even ſlaves, and the vileſt of the perjured rabble, brought againſt the followers of JESUS. And the Chriſtians were put to the moſt cruel tortures, and were condemned to meet death in the moſt barbarous forms, notwithſtanding their perfect innocence and their perſevering and ſolemn denial of the horrid crimes laid to their charge. The imperial edicts were ſo poſitive and expreſs againſt inflicting puniſhment upon ſuch of the Chriſtians as were guilty of no crime, that the corrupt judges, who, through motives of intereſt or popularity, deſired their deſtruction, were obliged to ſuborn falſe accuſers to charge them with actions that might bring them within the reach of the laws. Hence many fell victims to cruel ſuperſtition, and popular fury ſeconded by the corruption of a wicked magiſtracy, and the connivance of a prince, who, with reſpect to one ſet of men, forgot the principles of juſtice and clemency which directed his conduct towards all others. Among theſe victims, there were many men of illuſtrious piety, and ſome of eminent learning and abilities, ſuch as the holy and venerable POLYCARP, biſhop of *Smyrna*, and JUSTIN martyr, ſo deſervedly renowned for his erudition and philoſophy [z]. Many churches, particularly thoſe of *Lyons* and *Vienne*, were almoſt entirely deſtroyed, during this violent perſecution, which raged in the year 177, and will be an indelible ſtain upon the memory of the prince, by whoſe order it was carried on [a].

---

[w] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 148.

[x] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xiii. p. 126. [It is proper to be obſerved, that the word *crime*, in ſeveral former edicts, had not been ſufficiently determined in its ſignification; ſo that we find the enemies of the Chriſtians, and even the Roman magiſtrates, applying this term to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. But the equitable edict of this good emperor, decided that point on the ſide of humanity and juſtice, as appears from the letter he addreſſed to the province of *Aſia*, in favour of the perſecuted Chriſtians, and which concludes with the following words: "If any one, for the future, ſhall moleſt the Chriſtians, and accuſe them merely on account of their religion, let the perſon thus accuſed be diſcharged, though he is found to be a Chriſtian, and the accuſer be puniſhed according to the rigour of the law."]

[y] See MELITO *ap.* EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 147.

Their ſtate under Commodus and Severus.

VII. During the reign of COMMODUS, the Chriſtians ſuffered very little; no general perſecution raged againſt them; and any cruelties they endured were confined to a ſmall number, who had newly abandoned the Pagan ſuperſtitions [b]. But the ſcene changed towards the latter end of this century, when SEVERUS was declared emperor. Then *Aſia*, *Egypt*, and the other provinces were died with the blood of martyrs, as appears from the teſtimonies of TERTULLIAN, CLEMENS of *Alexandria*, and other writers. Thoſe, therefore, are not to be followed, who affirmed, that the Chriſtians ſuffered nothing under SEVERUS before the beginning of the third century, which was diſtinguiſhed by the cruel edicts of this emperor againſt their lives and fortunes. For, as the imperial laws againſt the Chriſtians were not abrogated, and the iniquitous edicts of TRAJAN and MARCUS ANTONINUS were ſtill in force, there was a door, of conſequence, open to the fury and injuſtice of corrupt magiſtrates, as often as they were pleaſed to exerciſe them upon the church. It was this ſeries of calamities, under which it groaned towards the concluſion of the ſecond century, which engaged TERTULLIAN to write his *Apology*, and ſeveral other books, in defence of the Chriſtians.

The calumnies, employed to render them odious.

VIII. It is very eaſy to account for the ſufferings and calamities with which the diſciples of JESUS were loaded, when we conſider how they were blackened and rendered odious by the railings, the calumnies, and libels of the heathen prieſts,

---

[z] A full account of their martyrdom is to be found in the valuable work of RUINART, intitled, *Acta Sincera Martyrum*.

[a] See the letter of the Chriſtians at *Lyons*, concerning this perſecution, which is to be found in EUSEBIUS's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, book v. ch. ii. as alſo in Fox's *Martyrology*, vol. i.

[b] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v. cap. xxiv. p. 191. cap. xvi. p. 183. cap. xviii. p. 186. cap. xix. p. 187.

CENT. II. prieſts, and the other defenders of a corrupt and moſt abominable ſyſtem of ſuperſtition. The injurious imputations, the horrid charges of which we took notice above, are mentioned by all thoſe who have written in defence of the Chriſtians, and ought, indeed, to ſtand always upon record, as a proof both of the weakneſs and wickedneſs of their adverſaries. Nothing more frivolous and inſignificant than the objections which the moſt famous defenders of paganiſm oppoſed to the truth of Chriſtianity at this time; and ſuch as deſire a convincing proof of this aſſertion, have only to read the arguments of CELSUS on that ſubject. This philoſopher wrote againſt the Chriſtians during the reign of ADRIAN, and was admirably refuted, in the following century, by ORIGEN, who repreſents him as an Epicurean (a miſtake which has been almoſt generally followed) whereas it appears, with the utmoſt probability, that he was a platonic philoſopher of the ſect of AMMONIUS. Be that as it will, CELSUS was a trifling caviller, as is manifeſt from the anſwer of ORIGEN; nor do his writings againſt Chriſtianity ſerve any other purpoſe, than to ſhew his malignant and illiberal turn of mind.

FRONTO the rhetorician, and CRESCENS the cynic philoſopher, made alſo ſome wretched attempts againſt Chriſtianity. The efforts of the former are only known by the mention that is made of them by MINUTIUS FELIX [c]; and the enterprizes of the latter were confined to a vehement zeal for the ruin of the Chriſtians, and a virulent perſecution of JUSTIN martyr, which ended in the cruel death of that eminent ſaint [d].

[c] *Octavio*, p. 266. edit. Heraldi.

[d] JUSTIN Mart. *Apologia ſecunda*, p. 21. TATIAN. *Orat. contra Græcos*, p. 72. edit. Worthii.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning.

I. UNDER the reign of TRAJAN, letters and philoſophy came forth from the retreat where they had languiſhed during the ſavage tyranny of his predeceſſors, and, by the auſpicious protection of this excellent prince, were, in ſome meaſure, reſtored to their former luſtre [e]. This happy revolution, in the republic of letters, was, indeed, but of a ſhort duration, as it was not ſupported by the following emperors, who were, for the moſt part, averſe to literary purſuits. Even MARCUS ANTONINUS, who ſurpaſſed them all in learning, gave protection and encouragement to the Stoics alone, and, after the example of that ſupercilious ſect, treated the arts and ſciences with indifference and contempt [f]. And here we ſee the true reaſon why the writers of this century are, in general, ſo much inferior to thoſe of the former, in point of elegance and purity, eloquence and taſte.

Learned men.

II. It muſt be obſerved, at the ſame time, that this degeneracy of erudition and taſte did not amount to an utter extinction of the one and the other. For, even in this century, there were, both among the Greeks and Romans, men of eminent genius and abilities, who ſet off, in the moſt advantageous manner, the learning of the times in which they lived. Among the learned Grecians, the firſt place is due to PLUTARCH, a man of vaſt erudition, whoſe knowledge was various, but indigeſted, and whoſe philoſophical taſte was corrupted by the ſceptical tenets of the academics. There were, likewiſe, in all the more conſiderable cities of the Roman empire rhetoricians, ſophiſts, and grammarians, who, by a variety of learned exerciſes, ſeemed zealous in forming the youth to the arts of eloquence and declamation, and in rendering them fit, by their talents and their acquiſitions, to be uſeful to their country. But the inſtruction acquired in theſe ſchools was more ſpecious than ſolid; and the youth who received their education in them, diſtinguiſhed themſelves at their entrance upon the active ſtage of life, more by empty declamation, than by true eloquence; more by pompous erudition, than by wiſdom and dexterity in the management of public affairs. The conſequence of this was, that the rhetoricians and ſophiſts, though agreeable to the corrupt taſte of the times, which was incapable, generally ſpeaking, of perceiving the native charms of truth, yet fell into contempt among the prudent and the wiſe,

---

[e] PLIN. epiſt. lib. iii. ep. 18.

[f] In the firſt book of his meditations, § 7. 17.

who held in deriſion the knowledge and education that were acquired in their auditories. Beſides the ſchools now mentioned, there were two public academies in the empire, the one at *Rome* founded by Adrian, in which all the ſciences were taught; and the other at *Berytus* in *Phœnicia*, which was principally deſtined for the education of the youth in the ſcience of law [g].

Stoics.

Platonics.

Epicureans.

III. Many philoſophers of all the different ſects flouriſhed at this time, whoſe names we think it not neceſſary to mention [h]. Two, however, there were of ſuch remarkable and ſhining merit, as rendered them real ornaments to the Stoic philoſophy, which the meditations of Marcus Antoninus, and the manual of Epictetus abundantly teſtify. Theſe two great men had more admirers than diſciples and followers; for in this century, the ſtoical ſect was not in the higheſt eſteem, as the rigour and auſterity of its doctrine were, by no means, ſuited to the diſſolute manners of the times. The Platonic ſchools were more frequented for ſeveral reaſons, and particularly for theſe two, that their moral precepts were leſs rigorous and ſevere, than thoſe of the Stoics, and their doctrines more conformable to, or, rather, leſs incompatible with, the common opinions concerning the gods. But of all the philoſophers, the Epicureans enjoyed the greateſt reputation, and had undoubtedly the greateſt number of followers, becauſe their opinions tended to encourage the indolent ſecurity of a voluptuous and effeminate life, and to baniſh the remorſe and terrors that haunt vice, and naturally incommode the wicked in their ſenſual purſuits [i].

The riſe of the new Platonics in *Egypt*.

IV. Towards the concluſion of this century, a new ſect of philoſophers aroſe of a ſudden, ſpred with amazing rapidity throughout the greateſt part of the Roman empire, ſwallowed up almoſt all the other ſects, and was extremely detrimental to the cauſe of Chriſtianity. *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, which had been, for a long time, the ſeat of learning, and, as it were, the center of all the liberal arts and ſciences, gave birth to this new philoſophy. Its votaries choſe to be called Platonics, though, far from adhering to all the tenets of Plato, they collected, from the different ſects, ſuch doctrines as they thought conformable to truth, and formed thereof one general ſyſtem. The reaſon then, why they diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the title of Platonics, was, that they thought the ſentiments of Plato, concerning that moſt noble part of philoſophy, which has the deity and things inviſible for its objects, much more rational and ſublime, than thoſe of the other philoſophers.

V. What gave to this new philoſophy a ſuperior air of reaſon and dignity, was, the unprejudiced ſpirit of candour and impartiality on which it ſeemed to be founded. This recommended it particularly to thoſe real ſages, whoſe inquiries were accompanied with wiſdom and moderation, and who were ſick of thoſe arrogant and contentious ſects, which required an invariable attachment to their particular ſyſtems. And, indeed, nothing could have a more engaging aſpect than a ſet of men, who, abandoning all cavil, and all prejudices in favour of any party, profeſſed ſearching after the truth alone, and were ready to adopt, from all the different ſyſtems and ſects, ſuch tenets as they thought agreeable to it. From hence alſo they were called Eclectics. It is, however, to be obſerved, as we hinted in the former ſection, that though theſe philoſophers were attached to no particular ſect, yet they preferred, as appears from a variety of teſtimonies, the ſublime PLATO to all other ſages, and approved of the moſt of his opinions concerning the deity, the univerſe, and the human ſoul.

---

[g] See the meditations of M. Antoninus, book i. § 7. 10. 17.

[h] Justin Mart. *Dialog. cum Tryphone. Opp.* p. 218, &c. We find alſo many of theſe philoſophers mentioned in the meditations of the emperor Marc. Antoninus.

[i] Lucian *Pſeudomant.* p. 763. tom. i. *Opp.*

Called alſo Eclectics.

Their diſcipline approved by the Chriſtians.

VI. This new ſpecies of platoniſm was embraced by ſuch of the Alexandrian Chriſtians as were deſirous to retain, with the profeſſion of the goſpel, the title, the dignity, and the habit of philoſophers. It is alſo ſaid to have had the particular approbation of ATHENAGORAS, PANTÆNUS, CLEMENS the Alexandrian, and all thoſe who, in this century, were charged with the care of the public ſchool [k], which the Chriſtians had at *Alexandria*. Theſe ſages were of opinion, that *true philoſophy*, the greateſt and moſt ſalutary gift of God to mortals, was ſcattered in various portions through all the different ſects, and that it was, conſequently, the duty of every wiſe man, and more eſpecially of every Chriſtian doctor, to gather it from the ſeveral corners, where it lay diſperſed, and to employ it, thus reunited, in the defence of religion, and in deſtroying the dominion of impiety and vice. The Chriſtian Eclectics had this alſo in common with the others, that they preferred PLATO to the other philoſophers, and looked upon his opinions concerning God, the human ſoul, and things inviſible, as conformable to the ſpirit and genius of the Chriſtian doctrine.

The new method of teaching philoſophy introduced by Ammonius Saccas.

VII. This philoſophical ſyſtem underwent ſome changes, when AMMONIUS SACCAS, who taught with the higheſt applauſe in the Alexandrian ſchool about the concluſion of this century, laid the foundations of that ſect which was diſtinguiſhed by the name of the New Platonics. This learned man was born of Chriſtian parents, and never, perhaps, gave up entirely the outward profeſſion of that divine religion, in which he had been educated [l]. As his genius was vaſt and comprehenſive, ſo were his projects bold and ſingular. For he attempted a general reconciliation or coalition of all ſects, whether philoſophical or religious, and taught a doctrine, which he looked upon as proper to unite them all, the Chriſtians not excepted, in the moſt perfect harmony. And herein lies the difference between this new ſect and the Eclectics, who had, before this time, flouriſhed in *Egypt*. The Eclectics held, that in every ſect there was a mixture of good and bad, of truth and falſhood, and accordingly they choſe and adopted out of each of them, ſuch tenets as ſeemed to them conformable to reaſon and truth, and rejected ſuch as they thought repugnant to both. AMMONIUS, on the contrary, maintained, that the great principles of all philoſophical and religious truth were to be found, equally, in all ſects; that they differed from each other, only in their method of expreſſing them, and in ſome opinions of little or no importance; and that, by a proper interpretation of their reſpective ſentiments, they might eaſily be united into one body. It is further to be obſerved, that the propenſity of AMMONIUS to ſingularity and paradox, led him to maintain, that all the gentile religions, and even the Chriſtian, were to be illuſtrated and explained by the principles of this univerſal philoſophy; but that, in order to this, the fables of the prieſts were to be removed from paganiſm, and the comments and interpretations of the diſciples of JESUS from Chriſtianity.

---

[k] The title and dignity of philoſophers delighted ſo much theſe honeſt men, that, though they were advanced in the church to the rank of preſbyters, they would not abandon the philoſopher's *cloak*. See ORIGEN. *Epiſt. ad Euſebium*, tom. i. *Opp.* p. 2. edit. de la Rue.

[(*l*) PORPHYRY, in his third book againſt the Chriſtians, maintains, that AMMONIUS deſerted the Chriſtian religion, and went over to paganiſm as ſoon as he came to that time of life, when the mind is capable of making a wiſe and judicious choice. EUSEBIUS, on the other hand, denies this aſſertion, maintains, that AMMONIUS perſevered conſtantly in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and is followed, in this opinion, by VALESIUS, BAYLE, BASNAGE, and others. The learned FABRICIUS is of opinion, that EUSEBIUS confounded together two perſons, who bore the name of AMMONIUS, one of whom was a Chriſtian writer, and the other a heathen philoſopher. See FABRIC. *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 159. The truth of the matter ſeems to have been, that AMMONIUS SACCAS was a Chriſtian, who adopted with ſuch dexterity the doctrines of the Pagan philoſophy, as to appear a Chriſtian to the Chriſtians, and a Pagan to the Pagans. See BRUCKER's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, vol. ii. and iii.]

The principles of the Ammonian or Eclectic philoſophy.

VIII. This arduous deſign, which AMMONIUS had formed of bringing about a coalition of all the various philoſophical ſects, and all the different ſyſtems of religion, that prevailed in the world, required many difficult and diſagreeable things in order to its execution. Every particular ſect and religion muſt have ſeveral of its doctrines curtailed or diſtorted, before it could enter into the general maſs. The tenets of the philoſophers, the ſuperſtitions of the heathen prieſts, the ſolemn doctrines of Chriſtianity, were all to ſuffer in this cauſe, and forced allegories were to be ſubtly employed in removing the difficulties with which it was attended. How this vaſt project was effected by AMMONIUS, the writings of his diſciples and followers, that yet remain, abundantly teſtify. In order to the accompliſhing his purpoſe, he ſuppoſed, that true philoſophy derived its origin and its conſiſtence from the eaſtern nations; that it was taught to the Egyptians by HERMES; that it was brought from them to the Greeks, by whoſe vain ſubtilties and litigious diſputes it was rendered ſomewhat obſcure and deformed; but was, however, preſerved in its original purity by PLATO, who was the beſt interpreter of HERMES, and of the other oriental ſages. He maintained, that all the different religions that prevailed in the world, were, in their original integrity, conformable to the genius of this ancient philoſophy; but that it unfortunately happened that the ſymbols and fictions, under which, according to the eaſtern manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and their doctrines were, in proceſs of time, erroneouſly underſtood both by prieſts and people in a literal ſenſe; that, in conſequence of this, the inviſible beings and demons, whom the ſupreme deity had placed in the different parts of the univerſe as the miniſters of his providence, were, by the ſuggeſtions of ſuperſtition, converted into gods, and worſhiped with a multiplicity of vain ceremonies. He therefore inſiſted, that all the religions of all nations ſhould be reſtored to their original purity, and reduced to their primitive ſtandard, *viz*, "The ancient philoſophy of the eaſt;" and he affirmed, that this his project was agreeable to the intentions of JESUS CHRIST, whoſe ſole view, in deſcending upon earth, was, to ſet bounds to the reigning ſuperſtition, to remove the errors that had crept into the religions of all nations, but not to aboliſh the ancient theology from whence they were derived.

Its chief articles.

IX. Taking theſe principles for granted, AMMONIUS adopted the doctrines which were received in *Egypt*, the place of his birth and education, concerning the *univerſe* and the *deity* conſidered as conſtituting one great WHOLE; as alſo concerning the *eternity of the world*, the *nature of ſouls*, the *empire of providence*, and the *government of this world by demons*. For it is moſt evident, that the Egyptian philoſophy, which was ſaid to be derived from HERMES, was the baſis of that of AMMONIUS; or, as it is otherwiſe called, of the *more modern platoniſm*; and the book of JAMBLICHUS, concerning *the myſteries of the Egyptians*, puts the matter beyond diſpute. AMMONIUS, therefore, aſſociated the ſentiments of the Egyptians with the doctrines of PLATO, which was eaſily done by adulterating ſome of the opinions of the latter, and forcing his expreſſions from their obvious and natural ſenſe. And, to finiſh this conciliatory ſcheme, he ſo interpreted the doctrines of the other philoſophical and religious ſects, by the violent ſuccours of art, invention, and allegory, that they ſeemed, at length, to bear ſome reſemblance of the Egyptian and Platonic ſyſtems.

The moral diſcipline of Ammonius.

X. To this monſtrous coalition of heterogeneous doctrines, its fanatical author added a rule of life and manners, which carried an aſpect of high ſanctity and uncommon auſterity. He, indeed, permitted the people to live according to the laws of their country and the dictates of nature; but a more ſublime rule was laid down for the wiſe. They were to raiſe above all terreſtrial things, by the towring efforts of holy contemplation, thoſe ſouls whoſe origin was celeſtial and divine. They were ordered to extenuate, by hunger, thirſt, and other mortifications, the ſluggiſh body, which confines the activity, and reſtrains the liberty of the immortal ſpirit; that thus, in this life, they might enjoy communion with the ſupreme being, and aſcend after death, active and unencumbered, to the univerſal parent, to live in his preſence for ever. As AMMONIUS was born and educated among the Chriſtians, he ſet off, and even gave an air of authority to theſe injunctions, by expreſſing them partly in terms borrowed from the ſacred ſcriptures, of which we find a vaſt number of citations, alſo, in the writings of his diſciples. To this auſtere diſcipline, he added the pretended art of ſo purging and refining that faculty of the mind, which receives the images of things, as to render it capable of perceiving the demons, and of performing many marvelous things by their aſſiſtance. This art, which the diſciples of AMMONIUS called *theurgy*, was not, however, communicated to all the ſchools of this fanatical philoſopher, but only to thoſe of the firſt rank.

His opinions concerning God and CHRIST.

XI. The extravagant attempts of AMMONIUS did not ceaſe here. To reconcile the popular religions of different countries, and particularly the Chriſtian, with this new ſyſtem, he fell upon the following inventions: *1ſt*, He turned into a mere allegory the whole hiſtory of the gods, and maintained that thoſe beings, whom the prieſts and people dignified with this title, were no more than celeſtial miniſters, to whom a certain kind of worſhip was due; but a worſhip inferior to that which was to be reſerved for the ſupreme deity.

2*dly*, He acknowledged CHRIST to be a moſt excellent man, the friend of God, the admirable *theurge*; he denied, however, that JESUS deſigned to aboliſh entirely the worſhip of demons, and of the other miniſters of divine providence, and affirmed, on the contrary, that his only intention was to purify the ancient religion, and that his followers had manifeſtly corrupted the doctrine of their divine maſter [m].

The pernicious effects of this philoſophy.

XII. This new ſpecies of philoſophy, imprudently adopted by ORIGEN and many other Chriſtians, was extremely prejudicial to the cauſe of the goſpel, and to the beautiful ſimplicity of its celeſtial doctrines. For hence it was, that the Chriſtian doctors began to introduce their ſubtle and obſcure erudition into the religion of JESUS, to involve in the darkneſs of a vain philoſophy, ſome of the principal truths of Chriſtianity that had been revealed with the utmoſt plainneſs, and were indeed obvious to the meaneſt capacity, and to add, to the divine precepts of our Lord, many of their own, which had no ſort of foundation in any part of the ſacred writings. From the ſame ſource aroſe that melancholy ſet of men, who have been diſtinguiſhed by the name of Myſtics, whoſe ſyſtem, when ſeparated from the Platonic doctrine concerning the nature and origin of the ſoul, is but a lifeleſs maſs, without any vigour, form, or conſiſtence. Nor did the evils, which ſprung from this Ammonian philoſophy, end here. For under the ſpecious pretext of the neceſſity of contemplation, it gave occaſion to that ſlothful and indolent courſe of life, which continues to be led by myriads of monks retired in cells, and ſequeſtred from ſociety, to which they are neither uſeful by their inſtructions, nor by their examples. To this philoſophy we may trace as to their ſource, a multitude of vain and fooliſh ceremonies, proper only to caſt a veil over truth, and to nouriſh ſuperſtition, and which are, for the moſt part, religiouſly obſerved by many, even in the times in which we live. It would be endleſs to enumerate all the pernicious conſequences that may be juſtly attributed to this new philoſophy, or rather to this monſtrous attempt to reconcile falſhood with truth, and light with darkneſs. Some of its moſt fatal effects were its alienating the minds of many, in the following ages, from the Chriſtian religion, and its ſubſtituting in the place of the pure and ſublime ſimplicity of the goſpel an unſeemly mixture of Platoniſm and Chriſtianity.

The ſtate of learning among Chriſtians.

XIII. The number of learned men among the Chriſtians, which was very ſmall in the preceding century, grew conſiderably in this. Among theſe there were few rhetoricians, ſophiſts, or orators. The moſt part were philoſophers attached to the Eclectic ſyſtem, though they were not all of the ſame ſentiments concerning the utility of letters and philoſophy. Thoſe, who were themſelves initiated into the depths of philoſophy, were deſirous that others, particularly ſuch as aſpired to the offices of biſhops or doctors, ſhould apply themſelves to the ſtudy of human wiſdom, in order to their being the better qualified for defending the truth with vigour, and inſtructing the ignorant with ſucceſs. Others were of a quite different way of thinking upon this ſubject, and were for baniſhing all argumentation and philoſophy from the limits of the church, from a notion that erudition might prove detrimental to the true ſpirit of religion. Hence the early beginnings of that unhappy conteſt between *faith* and *reaſon*, *religion* and *philoſophy*, *piety* and *genius*, which increaſed in the ſucceeding ages, and is prolonged even to our times with a violence, that renders it extremely difficult to be brought to a concluſion. Thoſe, who maintained that learning and philoſophy were rather advantageous, than detrimental to the cauſe of religion, gained, by degrees, the aſcendant, and, in conſequence thereof, laws were enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from the office of public teachers. The oppoſite ſide of the queſtion was not, however, without defenders; and the defects and vices of learned men and philoſophers contributed much to increaſe their number, as will appear in the progreſs of this hiſtory.

---

[m] What we have here mentioned concerning the doctrines and opinions of AMMONIUS, is gathered from the writings and diſputations of his diſciples, who are known by the name of the Modern Platonics. This philoſopher has left nothing in writing behind him; nay, he impoſed a law upon his diſciples not to divulge his doctrines among the multitude, which law, however, they made no ſcruple to neglect and violate. See PORPHYR. *Vit. Plotini*, cap. iii. p. 97. edit. Fabricii, lib. iv. *Biblioth. Græcæ*. At the ſame time there is no ſort of doubt, but that all theſe inventions belong properly to AMMONIUS, whom all the latter Platonics acknowledge as the founder of their ſect, and the author of their philoſophy.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and the form of its government.

The form of church government.

I. THE form of eccleſiaſtical government, whoſe commencement we have ſeen in the laſt century, was brought in this, to a greater degree of ſtability and conſiſtence. One inſpector, or *biſhop*, preſided over each Chriſtian aſſembly, to which office he was elected by the voices of the whole people. In this poſt he was to be watchful and provident, attentive to the wants of the church, and careful to ſupply them. To aſſiſt him in this laborious province, he formed a council of *preſbyters*, which was not confined to any fixed number, and to each of theſe he diſtributed his taſk, and appointed a ſtation, in which he was to promote the intereſts of the church. To the biſhops and preſbyters the miniſters, or *deacons*, were ſubject; and the latter were divided into a variety of claſſes, as the different exigencies of the church required.

Aſſociation of the provincial churches.

II. During a great part of this century, the Chriſtian churches were independent of each other, nor were they joined together by aſſociation, confederacy, or any other bonds, but thoſe of charity. Each Chriſtian aſſembly was a little ſtate, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or, at leaſt, approved by the ſociety. But, in proceſs of time, all the Chriſtian churches of a province were formed into one large eccleſiaſtical body, which, like confederate ſtates, aſſembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common intereſts of the whole. This inſtitution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent ſtates, and the regular aſſemblies which met, in conſequence thereof, at fixed times, and were compoſed of the deputies of each reſpective ſtate. But theſe eccleſiaſtical aſſociations were not long confined to the Greeks;

their great utility was no ſooner perceived, than they became univerſal, and were formed in all places where the goſpel had been planted [n]. To theſe aſſemblies, in which the deputies or commiſſioners of ſeveral churches conſulted together, the name of *ſynods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted in theſe general meetings were called *canons*, i. e. *rules*.

Origin of councils.

The authority of the biſhops augmented by theſe councils.

III. Theſe *councils*, of which we find not the ſmalleſt trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form; for by them the ancient privileges of the people were conſiderably diminiſhed, and the power and authority of the biſhops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of theſe pious prelates prevented their aſſuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards inveſted. At their firſt appearance in theſe general councils, they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their reſpective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of their people. But they ſoon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their counſels into laws, and openly aſſerted, at length, that CHRIST had empowered them to preſcribe to his people *authoritative rules* of *faith* and *manners*. Another effect of theſe councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality, which reigned among all biſhops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of theſe aſſemblies required, that ſome one of the provincial biſhops met in council, ſhould be inveſted with a ſuperior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of Metropolitans derive their origin. In the mean time, the bounds of the church were enlarged; the cuſtom of holding councils was followed wherever the ſound of the goſpel had reached, and the univerſal church had now the appearance of one vaſt republic formed by a combination of a great number of little ſtates. This occaſioned the creation of a new order of eccleſiaſtics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whoſe office it was to preſerve the conſiſtence and union of that immenſe body, whoſe members were ſo widely diſperſed throughout the nations. Such was the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, ambition being arrived to its moſt inſolent period, formed a new dignity, inveſting the biſhop of *Rome*, and his ſucceſſors, with the title and authority of prince of the Patriarchs.

Metropolitans.

An artful parallel drawn between the Chriſtian and the Jewiſh prieſthood.

IV. The Chriſtian doctors had the good fortune to perſuade the people, that the miniſters of the Chriſtian church ſucceeded to the character, rights, and privileges of the Jewiſh prieſthood, and this perſuaſion was a new ſource both of honours and profit to the ſacred order. This notion was propagated with induſtry ſome time after the reign of ADRIAN, when the ſecond deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* had extinguiſhed among the Jews all hopes of ſeeing their government reſtored to its former luſtre, and their country ariſing out of ruins. And, accordingly, the *biſhops* conſidered themſelves as inveſted with a rank and character ſimilar to thoſe of the *high-prieſt* among the Jews, while the *preſbyters* repreſented the prieſts, and the *deacons* the *levites*. It is, indeed, highly probable, that they, who firſt introduced this abſurd compariſon of offices ſo entirely diſtinct, did it rather through ignorance and error, than through artifice or deſign. The notion, however, once introduced, produced its natural effects, and theſe effects were pernicious. The errors to which it gave riſe were many, and one of its immediate conſequences was the eſtabliſhing a greater difference between the Chriſtian paſtors and their flock, than the genius of the goſpel ſeems to admit.

---

[n] TERTULLIAN, *Lib. de Jejuniis*, cap. xiii. p. 711.

The principal writers.

V. From the government of the church, let us turn our eyes to thoſe who maintained its cauſe by their learned and judicious writings. Among theſe was Justin, a man of eminent piety and conſiderable learning, who, from a Pagan philoſopher, became a Chriſtian martyr. He had frequented all the different ſects of philoſophy in an ardent and impartial purſuit of truth, and finding, neither among Stoics nor Peripatetics, neither in the Pythagorean nor Platonic ſchools, any ſatisfactory account of the perfections of the ſupreme being, and the nature and deſtination of the human ſoul, he embraced Chriſtianity on account of the light which it caſt upon theſe intereſting ſubjects. We have yet remaining his two *apologies* in behalf of the Chriſtians, which are moſt deſervedly held in high eſteem; notwithſtanding that, in ſome paſſages of them, he ſhews himſelf an unwary diſputer, and betrays a want of acquaintance with ancient hiſtory.

Irenæus, biſhop of *Lyons*, a Greek by birth, and probably born of Chriſtian parents, a diſciple alſo of Polycarp, by whom he was ſent to preach the goſpel among the Gauls, is another of the writers of this century, whoſe labours were ſingularly uſeful to the church. He turned his pen againſt its internal and domeſtic enemies, by attacking the monſtrous errors which were adopted by many of the primitive Chriſtians, as appears by his *five books againſt hereſies*, which are yet preſerved in a Latin tranſlation [*o*], and are conſidered as one of the moſt precious monuments of ancient erudition.

Athenagoras alſo deſerves a place among the eſtimable writers of this age. He was a philoſopher of no mean reputation, and his *apology* for the Chriſtians, as well as his *treatiſe upon the reſurrection*, afford ſtriking proofs of his learning and genius.

The works of Theophilus, biſhop of *Antioch*, are more remarkable for their erudition, than for their order and method; this, at leaſt, is true of his *three books in defence of Chriſtianity*, addreſſed to Autolycus [*p*]. But the moſt illuſtrious writer of this century, and the moſt juſtly renowned for his various erudition, and his perfect acquaintance with the ancient ſages, was Clemens, the diſciple of Pantænus, and the head of the Alexandrian ſchool, deſtined for the inſtruction of the catechumens. His *Stromata*, *Pe-*

[(*o*) The firſt book is yet extant in the original Greek; of the reſt, we have only a Latin verſion, through the barbarity of which, though exceſſive, it is eaſy to diſcern the eloquence and erudition that reign throughout the original. See *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*.]

[(*p*) Theophilus was the author of ſeveral works, beſide thoſe mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, particularly of a *commentary upon the Proverbs*, another upon the *Four Evangeliſts*, and of ſeveral ſhort and pathetic diſcourſes, which he publiſhed, from time to time, for the uſe of his flock. He alſo wrote againſt Marcion and Hermogenes, and, refuting the errors of theſe heretics, he quotes ſeveral paſſages of the *Revelations*.]

dagogue, and *Exhortation*, addreſſed to the Greeks, which are yet extant, abundantly ſhew the extent of his learning and the force of his genius; though he is neither to be admired for the preciſion of his ideas, nor for the perſpicuity of his ſtyle. It is alſo to be lamented, that his exceſſive attachment to the reigning philoſophy led him into a variety of pernicious errors.

Hitherto we have made no mention of the Latin writers, who employed their pens in the Chriſtian cauſe. And, indeed, the only one of any note, we find in this century, is TERTULLIAN, by birth a Carthaginian, who, having firſt embraced the profeſſion of the law, became afterwards a preſbyter of the church, and concluded by adopting the heretical viſions of MONTANUS. He was a man of extenſive learning, of a fine genius, and highly admired for his elocution in the Latin tongue. We have ſeveral works of his yet remaining, which were deſigned to explain and defend the truth, and to nouriſh pious affections in the hearts of Chriſtians. There was, indeed, ſuch a mixture in the qualities of this man, that it is difficult to fix his real character, and to determine which of the two were predominant, his *virtues*, or his *defects*. He was endowed with a great genius, but ſeemed deficient in point of judgment. His piety was warm and vigorous, but, at the ſame time, melancholy and auſtere. His learning was extenſive and profound; and yet his credulity and ſuperſtition were ſuch as might have been expected from the darkeſt ignorance. And with reſpect to his reaſonings, they had more of that ſubtilty that dazzles the imagination, than of that ſolidity that brings light and conviction to the mind [*q*].

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The ſimplicity of primitive Chriſtianity.

I. THE Chriſtian ſyſtem, as it was hitherto taught, preſerved its native and beautiful ſimplicity, and was comprehended in a ſmall number of articles. The public teachers inculcated no other doctrines, than thoſe that are contained in, what is commonly called, the *Apoſtles Creed*: and, in the method of illuſtrating them, all vain ſubtilties, all myſterious reſearches, every thing that was beyond the reach of common capacities, were carefully avoided. This will by no means appear ſurprizing to thoſe who conſider, that, at this time, there was not the leaſt controverſy about thoſe capital doctrines of Chriſtianity, which were afterwards ſo keenly debated in the church; and who reflect, that the biſhops of theſe primitive times were, for the moſt part, plain and illiterate men, remarkable rather for their piety and zeal, than for their learning and eloquence.

[*q*] It is proper to point out to ſuch, as are deſirous of a more particular account of the works, as alſo of the excellencies and defects of theſe ancient writers, the authors who have profeſſedly written concerning them, and the principal are thoſe who follow: JO. ALB. FABRICIUS *in Biblioth. Græc. & Latin.* CAVE, *Hiſt. Litter. Scriptor. Eccl.* DU PIN et CELLIER, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques.*

Altered by degrees.

II. This venerable ſimplicity was not, indeed, of a long duration; its beauty was gradually effaced by the laborious efforts of human learning, and the dark ſubtilties of imaginary ſcience. Acute reſearches were employed upon ſeveral religious ſubjects, concerning which ingenious deciſions were pronounced; and, what was worſt of all, ſeveral tenets of a chimerical philoſophy were imprudently incorporated into the Chriſtian ſyſtem. This diſadvantageous change, this unhappy alteration of the primitive ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion was chiefly owing to two reaſons, the one drawn from pride; and the other from a ſort of neceſſity. The former was the eagerneſs of certain learned men, to bring about a union between the doctrines of Chriſtianity, and the opinions of the philoſophers; for they thought it a very fine accompliſhment to be able to expreſs the precepts of CHRIST in the language of *philoſophers*, *civilians*, and *rabbins*. The other reaſon, that contributed to alter the ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion, was, the neceſſity of having recourſe to logical definitions and nice deſtinctions, in order to confound the ſophiſtical arguments which the infidel and the heretic employed, the one to overturn the Chriſtian ſyſtem, and the other to corrupt it. [Theſe philoſophical arms, in the hands of the judicious and wiſe, were both honourable and uſeful to religion; but when they came to be handled by every ignorant and ſelf-ſufficient meddler, as was afterwards the caſe, they produced nothing but perplexity and confuſion, under which genuine Chriſtianity almoſt diſappeared.]

This proved by an example.

III. Many examples might be alleged, which verify the obſervations we have now been making; and, if the reader is deſirous of a ſtriking one, he has only to take a view of the doctrines which began to be taught in this century, concerning the ſtate of the ſoul after the diſſolution of the body. JESUS and his diſciples had ſimply declared, that the ſouls of good men were, at their departure from their bodies, to be received into heaven, while thoſe of the wicked were to be ſent to hell; and this was ſufficient for the firſt diſciples of CHRIST to know, as they had more piety, than curioſity, and were ſatisfied with the knowledge of this ſolemn fact, without any inclination to penetrate its *manner*, or to pry into its ſecret reaſons. But this plain doctrine was ſoon diſguiſed, when Platoniſm began to infect Chriſtianity. PLATO had taught, that the ſouls of heros, of illuſtrious men, and eminent philoſophers alone, aſcended, after death, into the manſions of light and felicity; while thoſe of the generality, weighed down by their luſts and paſſions, ſunk into the infernal regions, from whence they were not permitted to emerge, before they were purified from their turpitude and corruption [r]. This doctrine was ſeized with avidity by the Platonic Chriſtians, and applied as a commentary upon that of JESUS. Hence a notion prevailed, that the *martyrs* only entred upon a ſtate of happineſs immediately after death, and that, for the reſt, a certain obſcure region was aſſigned, in which they were to be impriſoned until the ſecond coming of CHRIST, or, at leaſt, until they

---

[r] See an ample account of the opinions of the Platonics, and other ancient philoſophers, upon this ſubject, in the notes which Dr. MOSHEIM has added to his Latin tranſlation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem*, tom. ii. p. 1036.

were purified, from their various pollutions. This doctrine, enlarged and improved upon by the irregular fancies of injudicious men, became a ſource of innumerable errors, vain ceremonies, and monſtrous ſuperſtitions.

Zeal for the holy ſcriptures.

IV. But, however, the doctrines of the goſpel may have been abuſed by the commentaries and interpretations of different ſects, yet all were unanimous in regarding with veneration the holy ſcriptures, as the great rule of faith and manners; and hence that laudable and pious zeal of adapting them to general uſe. We have mentioned already the tranſlations that were made of them into different languages, and it will not be improper to ſay ſomething here concerning thoſe who employed their uſeful labours in explaining and interpreting them. PANTÆNUS, the head of the Alexandrian ſchool, was probably the firſt, who enriched the church with a verſion of the ſacred writings, which has been loſt among the ruins of time. The ſame fate attended the *commentary* of CLEMENS the Alexandrian, upon the *canonical epiſtles*; and alſo another celebrated work [*s*] of the ſame author, in which he is ſaid to have explained, in a compendious manner, almoſt all the ſacred writings. The *harmony of the Evangeliſts*, compoſed by TATIAN, is yet extant. But the *expoſition of the Revelations*, by JUSTIN martyr, and of the *four goſpels* by THEOPHILUS biſhop of *Antioch*, together with ſeveral illuſtrations of the Moſaic hiſtory of the creation by other ancient writers, are all loſt.

The defects of the ancient interpreters.

V. The loſs of theſe ancient productions is the leſs to be regretted, that we know, with certainty, their vaſt inferiority to the expoſitions of the holy ſcriptures that appeared in ſucceeding times. Among the perſons already mentioned, there was none who deſerved the name of an eminent and judicious interpreter of the ſacred text. They all attributed a *double ſenſe* to the words of ſcripture, the one *obvious* and literal; the other *hidden* and myſterious, which lay concealed, as it were, under the veil of the outward letter. The former, they treated with the utmoſt neglect, and turned the whole force of their genius and application to unfold the latter: or, in other words, they were more ſtudious to darken the holy ſcriptures with their idle fictions, than to inveſtigate their true and natural ſenſe. Some of them alſo forced the expreſſions of ſacred writ out of their obvious meaning, in order to apply them to the ſupport of their philoſophical ſyſtems, of which dangerous and pernicious attempts, CLEMENS, of *Alexandria*, is ſaid to have given the firſt example. With reſpect to the expoſitors of the Old Teſtament in this century, we ſhall only make this general remark, that their exceſſive veneration for the Alexandrian verſion, commonly called the Septuagint, which they regarded almoſt as of divine authority, confined their views, fettered, as it were, their critical ſpirit, and hindered them from producing any thing excellent in the way of ſacred criticiſm or interpretation.

Of ſyſtematic divinity.

VI. If this age was not very fertile in ſacred critics, it was ſtill leſs ſo in expoſitors of the doctrinal parts of religion; for hitherto there was no attempt made, at leaſt, that is come to our knowledge, of compoſing a *ſyſtem*, or complete view of the Chriſtian doctrine. Some treatiſes of ARABIAN, relative to this ſubject, are indeed mentioned; but as they are loſt, and ſeem not to have

---

[*s*] Viz. CLEMENTIS *Hypotypoſes*.

been much known by any of the writers whoſe works have ſurvived them, we can form no concluſions concerning them. The books of PAPIAS, concerning *the ſayings of* CHRIST *and his apoſtles*, were, according to the accounts which EUSEBIUS gives of them, rather an hiſtorical commentary, than a theological ſyſtem. MELITO, biſhop of *Sardis*, is ſaid to have written ſeveral treatiſes, one concerning *faith*, another on the *creation*, a third concerning the *church*, and a fourth concerning *truth*; but it does not appear from the titles of theſe writings, whether they were of a doctrinal or controverſial nature [*t*]. Several of the polemic writers, indeed, have been naturally led, in the courſe of controverſy, to explain amply certain points of religion. But thoſe doctrines, which have not been diſputed, are very rarely defined with ſuch accuracy, by the ancient writers, as to point out to us clearly what their opinions concerning them were. And from hence it ought not to appear ſurprizing, that all the different ſects of Chriſtians pretend to find, in the writings of the fathers, deciſions favourable to their reſpective tenets.

The controverſial writers.

VII. The controverſial writers, who ſhone in this century, had three different ſorts of adverſaries to combat; the Jews, the Pagans, and the Heretics, or thoſe, who, in the boſom of Chriſtianity, corrupted its doctrines, and produced various ſects and diviſions in the church. JUSTIN martyr and TERTULLIAN embarked in a controverſy with the Jews, which it was not poſſible for them to manage with the higheſt ſucceſs and dexterity, as they were very little acquainted with the language, the hiſtory, and the learning of the Hebrews, and wrote with more levity and inaccuracy, than was juſtifiable on ſuch a ſubject. Of thoſe who managed the cauſe of Chriſtianity againſt the Pagans, ſome performed this important taſk by compoſing *apologies* for the Chriſtians; and others by addreſſing pathetic exhortations to the Gentiles. Among the former, were ATHENAGORAS, MELITO, QUADRATUS, MILTIADES, ARISTIDES, TATIAN, and JUSTIN martyr; and among the latter, TERTULLIAN, CLEMENS, JUSTIN, and THEOPHILUS biſhop of *Antioch*. All theſe writers attacked, with judgment, dexterity, and ſucceſs, the Pagan ſuperſtition, and alſo defended the Chriſtians, in a victorious manner, againſt all the calumnies and aſperſions of their enemies. But they did not ſucceed ſo well in unfolding the true nature and genius of Chriſtianity, nor were the arguments they made uſe of to demonſtrate its truth and divinity ſo full of energy, ſo ſtriking and irreſiſtible, as thoſe, by which they overturned the Pagan ſyſtem. In a word, both their explication and defence of many of the doctrines of Chriſtianity are defective and unſatisfactory in ſeveral reſpects. As to thoſe who directed their polemic efforts againſt the heretics, their number was prodigious, though few of their writings have come down to our times. IRENÆUS refuted the whole tribe, in a work deſtined ſolely for that purpoſe. CLEMENS [u], TERTULLIAN [w], and JUSTIN martyr, wrote alſo againſt all the ſectaries; but the work of the laſt, upon that ſubject, is not extant. It would be endleſs to mention thoſe who combated particular errors, of whoſe writings alſo many have diſappeared amidſt the decays of time, and the revolutions that have happened in the republic of letters.

[*t*] MELITO, beſide his *apology* for the Chriſtians, and the treatiſes mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM here, wrote a diſcourſe upon Eaſter, and ſeveral other diſſertations, of which we have only ſome ſcattered fragments remaining: but what is worthy of remark here, is, that he is the firſt Chriſtian writer that has given us a catalogue of the books of the Old Teſtament. His catalogue alſo is perfectly conformable to that of the Jews, except in this point only, that he has omitted in it the book of *Eſther*.]

Good and bad qualities of the ancient diſputants.

VIII. If the primitive defenders of Chriſtianity were not always happy in the choice of their arguments, yet they diſcovered more candour and probity than thoſe of the following ages. The artifice of ſophiſtry, and the habit of practiſing pious frauds in ſupport of the truth, had not, as yet, infected the Chriſtians. And this, indeed, is all that can be ſaid in their behalf; for they are worthy of little admiration on account of the accuracy or depth of their reaſonings. The moſt of them appear to have been deſtitute of penetration, learning, order, application, and force. They frequently make uſe of arguments void of all ſolidity, and much more proper to dazzle the fancy, than to enlighten and convince the mind. One, laying aſide the ſacred writings, from whence all the weapons of religious controverſy ſhould be drawn, refers to the deciſions of thoſe biſhops who ruled the apoſtolic churches. Another thinks, that the antiquity of a doctrine is a mark of its truth, and pleads preſcription againſt his adverſaries, as if he was maintaining his property before a civil magiſtrate, than which method of diſputing nothing can be more pernicious to the purſuit of truth. A third imitates thoſe wrong-headed diſputants among the Jews, who, infatuated with their cabbaliſtic jargon, offered, as arguments, the imaginary *powers* of certain myſtic words and choſen numbers [x]. Nor do they ſeem to err, who are of opinion, that in this century, that vitious method of diſputing, which afterwards obtained the name of *œconomical* [y], was firſt introduced [z].

Moral writers.

IX. The principal points of morality were treated by JUSTIN martyr, or, at leaſt, by the writer of the *epiſtle to* ZENA *and* SERENUS, which is to be found among the works of that celebrated author. Many other writers confined themſelves to particular branches of the moral ſyſtem, which they handled with much attention and zeal. Thus CLEMENS, of *Alexandria*, wrote ſeveral treatiſes concerning *calumny*, *patience*, *continence*, and other virtues, which diſcourſes have not reached our times. Thoſe of TERTULLIAN upon *chaſtity*, upon *flight in the time of perſecution*, as alſo upon *faſting*, *ſhows*, *female ornaments*, and *prayer*, have ſurvived the waſte of time, and might be red with much fruit, were the ſtyle, in which they are written, leſs laboured and difficult, and the ſpirit they breath leſs melancholy and moroſe.

---

[u] In his work, intitled, *Stromata*.

[w] In his *Præſcriptiones adverſus hæreticos*.

[x] Several examples, of this ſenſeleſs method of reaſoning, are to be found in different writers. See particularly BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, tom. iii. p. 660. 694.

[(y) The *œconomical* method of diſputing was that in which the diſputants accommodated themſelves, as far as was poſſible, to the taſte and prejudices of thoſe, whom they were endeavouring to gain over to the truth. Some of the firſt Chriſtians carried this condeſcenſion too far, and abuſed St. PAUL's example (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, 22.) to a degree inconſiſtent with the purity and ſimplicity of the Chriſtian doctrine.]

[z] RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. ii. p. 21.

Of the merit of the fathers, as moral writers.

X. Learned men are not unanimous concerning the degree of eſteem that is due to the authors now mentioned, and the other ancient moraliſts. Some repreſent them as the moſt excellent guides in the paths of piety and virtue, while others place them in the very loweſt rank of moral writers, conſider them as the very worſt of all inſtructors, and treat their precepts and deciſions as perfectly inſipid, and, in many reſpects, pernicious. We leave the determination of this point to ſuch as are more capable of pronouncing deciſively upon it, than we pretend to be [a]. It, however, appears to us inconteſtable, that, in the writings of the primitive fathers, there are ſeveral ſublime ſentiments, judicious thoughts, and many things that are naturally adapted to form a religious temper, and to excite pious and virtuous affections; while it muſt be confeſſed, on the other hand, that they abound ſtill more with precepts of an exceſſive and unreaſonable auſterity, with ſtoical and academical dictates, vague and indeterminate notions, and, what is yet worſe, with deciſions that are abſolutely falſe, and in evident oppoſition to the precepts of CHRIST. Before the queſtion mentioned above, concerning the merit of the ancient fathers, as moraliſts, be decided, a previous queſtion muſt be determined, *viz.* What is meant by a bad director in point of morals? and, if by ſuch a perſon be meant, one who has no determinate notion of the nature and limits of the duties incumbent upon Chriſtians, no clear and diſtinct ideas of virtue and vice; who has not penetrated the ſpirit and genius of thoſe ſacred books, to which alone we muſt appeal in every diſpute about Chriſtian virtue, and who, in conſequence thereof, fluctuates often in uncertainty, or falls into error in explaining the divine laws, though he may frequently adminiſter ſublime and pathetic inſtructions; if, by a bad guide in morals, ſuch a perſon, as we have now delineated, be meant, then it muſt be confeſſed, that this title belongs indiſputably to many of the fathers.

The double doctrine of certain moraliſts.

XI. The cauſe of morality, and, indeed, of Chriſtianity in general, ſuffered deeply by a capital error which was received in this century; an error admitted without any evil deſign, but yet with the utmoſt imprudence, and which, through every period of the church, even until the preſent time, has produced other errors without number, and multiplied the evils under which the goſpel has ſo often groaned. JESUS CHRIST preſcribed to all his diſciples one and the ſame rule of life and manners. But certain Chriſtian doctors, either through a deſire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in conſequence of a natural propenſity to a life of auſterity (which is a diſeaſe not uncommon in *Syria*, *Egypt*, and other eaſtern provinces) were induced to maintain, that CHRIST had eſtabliſhed a *double rule of ſanctity and virtue*, for two different orders of Chriſtians. Of theſe *rules* the *one* was ordinary, the

---

[a] This queſtion was warmly and learnedly debated between the deſervedly celebrated BARBEYRAC and CELLIER a Benedictine monk. BUDDEUS has given us an hiſtory of this controverſy, with his own judgment of it, in his *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 620, &c. BARBEYRAC, however, publiſhed after this a particular treatiſe in defence of the ſevere ſentence he had pronounced againſt the *fathers*. This ingenious performance was printed at *Amſterdam* in 1720, under the title of *Traité ſur la Morale des Peres*, and is highly worthy of the peruſal of thoſe who have a taſte for this moſt intereſting branch of literature, though they will find in it ſome imputations caſt upon the fathers, againſt which they may be eaſily defended.

other extraordinary; the *one* of a lower dignity, the *other* more ſublime; the *one* for perſons in the active ſcenes of life, the *other* for thoſe, who, in a ſacred retreat, aſpired after the glory of a celeſtial ſtate. In conſequence of this wild ſyſtem, they divided into two parts, all thoſe moral doctrines and inſtructions which they had received either by writing or tradition. One of theſe diviſions they called *precepts*, and the other *counſels*. They gave the name of *precepts* to thoſe laws, that were univerſally obligatory upon all orders of men; and that of *counſels* to thoſe that related to Chriſtians of a more ſublime rank, who propoſed to themſelves great and glorious ends, and breathed after an intimate communion with the ſupreme being.

Gives riſe to the Aſcetics.

XII. This *double doctrine* produced, all of a ſudden, a new ſet of men, who made profeſſion of uncommon degrees of ſanctity and virtue, and declared their reſolution of obeying all the *counſels* of CHRIST, in order to their enjoying communion with God here; and alſo, that, after the diſſolution of their mortal bodies, they might aſcend to him with the greater facility, and find nothing to retard their approach to the ſupreme center of their happineſs and perfection. They looked upon themſelves as prohibited the uſe of things, which it was lawful for other Chriſtians to enjoy, ſuch as *wine*, *fleſh*, *matrimony*, and *commerce* [b]. They thought it their indiſpenſable duty to extenuate the body by watchings, abſtinence, labour, and hunger. They looked for felicity in ſolitary retreats, in deſart places, where, by ſevere and aſſiduous efforts of ſublime meditation, they raiſed the ſoul above all external objects, and all ſenſual pleaſures. Both men and women impoſed upon themſelves the moſt ſevere taſk, the moſt auſtere diſcipline; all which, however, the fruit of pious intention, was, in the iſſue, extremely detrimental to Chriſtianity. Theſe perſons were called Aſcetics, Σπουδαῖοι, Ἔκλεκτοι, and Philoſophers, nor were they only diſtinguiſhed by their title from other Chriſtians, but alſo by their garb [c]. In this century, indeed, ſuch as embraced this auſtere kind of life, ſubmitted themſelves to all theſe mortifications in private, without breaking aſunder their ſocial bonds, or withdrawing themſelves from the concourſe of men. But, in proceſs of time, they retired into deſarts, and, after the example of the Eſſenes and Therapeutæ, they formed themſelves into certain companies.

Why certain Chriſtians became Aſcetics.

XIII. Nothing is more obvious than the reaſons that gave riſe to this auſtere ſect. One of the principal was, the ill-judged ambition of the Chriſtians to reſemble the Greeks and Romans, many of whoſe ſages and philoſophers diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the generality by their maxims, by their habit, and, indeed, by the whole plan of life and manners, which they had formed to themſelves, and by which they acquired a high degree of eſteem and authority. It is alſo well known, that, of all theſe philoſophers, there were none, whoſe ſentiments and diſcipline were ſo well received by the ancient Chriſtians as thoſe of the Platonics and Pythagoreans, who preſcribed in their leſſons *two* rules of conduct; *one* for the ſage, who aſpired to the ſublimeſt heights of virtue; and *another* for the people, involved in the cares and hurry of an active life [d]. The law of moral conduct, which the Platonics preſcribed to the philoſophers, was as follows: "The ſoul of the wiſe "man ought to be removed to the greateſt poſſible diſtance from the contagi-"ous influence of the body. And as the depreſſing weight of the body, the "force of its appetites, and connexions with a corrupt world, are in direct "oppoſition to this ſacred obligation; therefore all ſenſual pleaſures are to "be carefully avoided; the body is to be ſupported, or rather extenuated, "by a ſlender diet; *ſolitude* is to be ſought as the true manſion of virtue; "and *contemplation* to be employed as the means of raiſing the ſoul, as far as "is poſſible, to a ſublime freedom from all corporeal ties, and to a noble "elevation above all terreſtrial things [e]. The perſon, who lives in this "manner, ſhall enjoy, even in a preſent ſtate, a certain degree of communion "with the deity; and when the corporeal maſs is diſſolved, ſhall immediately "aſcend to the ſublime regions of felicity and perfection, without paſſing "through that ſtate of purification and trial, that awaits the generality of "mankind." It is eaſy to perceive, that this rigorous diſcipline was a natural conſequence of the peculiar opinions which theſe philoſophers, and ſome others that reſembled them, entertained, concerning the *nature of the ſoul*, the *influence of matter*, the *operations of inviſible beings or demons*, and the *formation of the world*. And as theſe opinions were adopted by the more learned among the Chriſtians, it was but natural that they ſhould embrace alſo the moral diſcipline which flowed from them.

---

[b] ATHENAGORAS, *Apologia pro Chriſtian.* cap. xxviii. p. 129. edit. Oxon.

[c] See SALMAS. *Comm. in Tertullianum de Pallio*, p. 7, 8, &c.

The progreſs of this diſcipline.

XIV. There is a particular conſideration that will enable us to render a natural account of the origin of thoſe religious ſeverities of which we have been now ſpeaking, and that is drawn from the genius and temper of the people by whom they were firſt practiſed. It was in *Egypt* that this moroſe diſcipline had its riſe; and it is obſervable, that that country has, in all times, as it were by an immutable law, or diſpoſition of nature, abounded with perſons of a melancholy complexion, and produced, in proportion to its extent, more gloomy ſpirits than any other part of the world [f]. It was here that the Eſſenes and the Therapeutæ, thoſe diſmal and gloomy ſects, dwelt principally long before the coming of Christ; as alſo many others of the Aſcetic tribe, who, led by a certain melancholy turn of mind, and a deluſive notion of rendering themſelves more acceptable to the deity by their auſterities, withdrew themſelves from human ſociety, and from all the innocent pleaſures and comforts of life [g]. From *Egypt* this ſour and unſociable diſcipline paſſed into *Syria*, and the neighbouring countries, which alſo abounded with perſons of the ſame diſmal conſtitution with that of the Egyptians [h]; and from thence, in proceſs of time, its infection reached to the European nations. Hence that train of auſtere and ſuperſtitious vows and rites, that yet, in many places, caſt a veil over the beauty and ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion. Hence the celibacy of the prieſtly order, the rigour of unprofitable pennances, and mortifications, the innumerable ſwarms of monks that refuſed their talents and labours to ſociety, and this in the ſenſeleſs purſuit of a viſionary ſort of perfection. Hence alſo that diſtinction between the *theoretical* and *myſtical* life, and many other fancies of like nature, which we ſhall have occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory.

---

[d] Theſe famous ſects made an important diſtinction between *living according to nature*, Ζῆν κατὰ φυσιν, and *living above nature*, Ζῆν ὑπὲρ φυσιν. The former was the rule preſcribed to the vulgar; the latter that which was to direct the conduct of the philoſophers, who aimed at ſuperior degrees of virtue. See Æneas Gazeus *in Theophraſt.* p. 29. edit. Barthii.

[e] The reader will find the principles of this fanatical diſcipline, in Porphyry's book περὶ ἀποχῆς, i. e. concerning *abſtinence*. That celebrated Platoniſt has explained at large the reſpective duties that belong to *active* and *contemplative* life, book i. § 27. and 41.

[f] See Maillet *Deſcription de l'Egypte*, tom. ii. p. 57 edit. in 4to de Paris.

[g] Herodot. *Hiſtor.* lib. ii. p. 104. ed. Gronov. Epiphanius, *Expoſit. fidei*, § 11. tom. ii. *Opp.* p. 1092. Tertullian. *De exhortatione caſtitat.* cap. xiii. p. 524. edit. Priorii. Athanasius *in vita Antonii*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 453.

The riſe of pious frauds among Chriſtians.

XV. It is generally true, that deluſions travel in a train, and that one miſtake produces many. The Chriſtians, who adopted the auſtere ſyſtem, which has been already mentioned, had certainly made a very falſe ſtep, and done much injury to their excellent and moſt reaſonable religion. But they did not ſtop here; another erroneous practice was adopted by them, which, though it was not ſo univerſal as the other, was yet extremely pernicious, and proved a ſource of numberleſs evils to the Chriſtian church. The Platoniſts and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim, that it was not only lawful, but even praiſe-worthy, to *deceive*, and even to uſe the expedient of a *lie* in order to advance the cauſe of *truth* and *piety*. The Jews, who lived in *Egypt*, had learned and received this maxim from them, before the coming of CHRIST, as appears inconteſtably from a multitude of ancient records; and the Chriſtians were infected from both theſe ſources with the ſame pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falſely to great and venerable names, from the *Sibylline verſes*, and ſeveral ſuppoſititious productions, which were ſpred abroad in this and the following century. It does not, indeed, ſeem probable, that all theſe *pious frauds* were cheargeable upon the profeſſion of *real* Chriſtianity, upon thoſe who entertained juſt and rational ſentiments of the religion of JESUS. The greateſt part of theſe fictitious writings, undoubtedly, flowed from the fertile invention of the Gnoſtic ſects, though it cannot be affirmed that even true Chriſtians were entirely innocent and irreproachable in this matter.

Of the lives of Chriſtians.

XVI. As the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the number of vitious and irregular perſons, who entered into it, were proportionably increaſed, as appears from the many complaints and cenſures that we find in the writers of this century. Several methods were made uſe of to ſtem the torrent of iniquity.

Excommunication.

Excommunication was peculiarly employed to prevent or puniſh the moſt heinous and enormous crimes; and the crimes, eſteemed ſuch, were *murder*, *idolatry*, and *adultery*, which terms, however, we muſt here underſtand in their more full and extenſive ſenſe. In ſome places, the commiſſion of any of theſe ſins cut off irrevocably the criminal from all hopes of reſtoration to the privileges of church-communion: in others, after a long, laborious, and painful courſe of probation and diſcipline, they were re-admitted into the boſom of the church [i].

---

[h] Jo. CHARDIN *voyages en Perſe*, tom. iv. p. 197. edit. Amſterd. 1735, 4to.

[i] By this diſtinction, we may eaſily reconcile the different opinions of the learned concern-

XVII. It

Penitential diſcipline among the Chriſtians modelled imperceptibly according to that of the heathen myſteries.

XVII. It is here to be attentively obſerved, that this cuſtom of excluding heinous offenders from the ſociety of Chriſtians, and of refuſing to reſtore them to their forfeited privileges, before they had given many inconteſtable marks of the ſincerity of their repentance, and the reality of their reformation, was at firſt extremely ſimple. A ſmall number of plain, yet judicious, rules made up the whole of this ſolemn inſtitution, which, however, was imperceptibly altered, enlarged by an addition of a vaſt multitude of rites, and new modelled according to the diſcipline uſed in the heathen myſteries [*k*]. Thoſe who have any acquaintance with the ſingular reaſons, that obliged the Chriſtians of thoſe ancient times to be careful in reſtraining the progreſs of vice, will readily grant, that it was incumbent upon the rulers of the church to perfect their diſcipline, and to render the reſtraints upon iniquity more ſevere. Yet ſtill it remains to be examined, whether it was expedient to borrow from the enemies of the truth the rules of this ſalutary diſcipline, and thus to ſanctify, in ſome meaſure, a part of the heathen ſuperſtition. But, however delicate ſuch a queſtion may be, when determined with a view to all the indirect or immediate conſequences of the matter in debate, the equitable and candid judge will conſider principally the good intention of thoſe from whom theſe ceremonies and inſtitutions proceed, and will overlook the reſt from a charitable condeſcenſion and indulgence to human weakneſs.

CHAP. IV.

Of the ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. THERE is no inſtitution ſo pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worſe, and load with additions foreign to its nature and original deſign. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of Chriſtianity. In this century many unneceſſary rites and ceremonies were added to the Chriſtian worſhip, the introduction of which was extremely offenſive to wiſe and good men [*l*]. Theſe changes, while they deſtroyed the beautiful ſimplicity of the goſpel, were naturally pleaſing to the groſs multitude, who are more delighted with the pomp and ſplendor of external inſtitutions, than with the native charms of rational and ſolid piety, and who generally give little attention to any objects but thoſe which ſtrike their outward ſenſes [*m*]. But other reaſons may be added to

---

ing the effects of excommunication. See Morinus, *De diſciplina Pœnitent.* lib. ix. cap. xix. p. 670. Sirmond *Hiſtoria Pœnitentiæ publicæ*, cap. i. p. 323, tom. iv. Opp. As alſo Joseph. Augustin. Orsi, *Diſſert. de criminum capitalium per tria priora ſæcula abſolutione*, publiſhed at *Milan* 1730, 4to.

[*k*] See Fabricius's *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* p. 397. and Morinus, *De Pœnitentia*, lib. i. cap. xv, xvi, &c.

[*l*] Tertullian *Lib. de Creatione*, p. 792. Opp.

[(*m*) It is not improper to remark here, that this attachment of the vulgar, to the pomp of ceremonies, is a circumſtance that has always been favourable to the ambitious views of the Romiſh clergy, ſince the pomp of religion naturally caſts a part of its glory and magnificence this, which, though they ſuppoſe no bad intentions, yet manifeſt a conſiderable degree of precipitation and imprudence.

First reaſons of the multiplication of ceremonies, *viz.* A deſire to enlarge the borders of the church.

II. And here we may obſerve, in the firſt place, that there is a high degree of probability in the notion of thoſe, who think that the biſhops augmented the number of religious rites in the Chriſtian worſhip, by way of accommodation to the infirmities and prejudices both of Jews and Heathens, in order to facilitate thus their converſion to Chriſtianity. Both Jews and Heathens were accuſtomed to a vaſt variety of pompous and magnificent ceremonies in their religious ſervice. And as they conſidered theſe rites as an eſſential part of religion, it was but natural that they ſhould behold, with indifference, and even with contempt, the ſimplicity of the Chriſtian worſhip, which was deſtitute of thoſe idle ceremonies that rendered their ſervice ſo ſpecious and ſtriking. To remove then, in ſome meaſure, this prejudice againſt Chriſtianity, the biſhops thought it neceſſary to increaſe the number of rites and ceremonies, and thus to render the public worſhip more ſtriking to the outward ſenſes [*n*].

Second reaſon, To refute calumnies and reproaches.

III. This addition of external rites was alſo deſigned to remove the opprobrious calumnies, which the Jewiſh and Pagan prieſts caſt upon the Chriſtians, on account of the ſimplicity of their worſhip, eſteeming them little better than Atheiſts, becauſe they had no *temples*, *altars*, *victims*, *prieſts*, nor any thing of that external pomp in which the vulgar are ſo prone to place the eſſence of religion. The rulers of the church adopted, therefore, certain external ceremonies, that thus they might captivate the ſenſes of the vulgar, and be able to refute the reproaches of their adverſaries. [This, it muſt be confeſſed, was a very awkward, and, indeed, a very pernicious ſtratagem; it was obſcuring the native luſtre of the goſpel, in order to extend its influence, and making it loſe, in point of real excellence, what it gained in point of popular eſteem. Some accommodations to the infirmities of mankind, ſome prudent inſtances of condeſcenſion to their invincible prejudices, are neceſſary in eccleſiaſtical, as well as in civil inſtitutions; but they muſt be of ſuch a

---

upon its miniſters, and thereby gives them, imperceptibly, a vaſt aſcendant over the minds of the people. The late Lord *Bolingbroke*, being preſent at the elevation of the hoſt in the cathedral at *Paris*, expreſſed to a nobleman, who ſtood near him, his ſurprize that the king of *France* ſhould commit the performance of ſuch an auguſt and ſtriking ceremony to any ſubject. How far ambition may, in this and the ſucceeding ages, have contributed to the accumulation of gaudy ceremonies, is a queſtion not eaſy to be determined.]

[*n*] A remarkable paſſage in the life of GREGORY, ſurnamed THAUMATURGUS, *i. e.* the wonder-worker, will illuſtrate this point in the cleareſt manner. The paſſage is as follows: "Cum animadvertiſſet (GREGORIUS) quod ob corporeas delectationes et voluptates ſimplex et "imperitum vulgus in ſimulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permiſit eis, ut in memoriam et "recordationem ſanctorum martyrum ſeſe oblectarent, et in lætitiam effunderentur, quod ſucceſſu temporis aliquando futurum eſſet, ut ſua ſponte ad honeſtiorem et accuratiorem vitæ "rationem tranſirent." *i. e.* "When GREGORY perceived that the ignorant multitude per-"ſiſted in their idolatry, on account of the pleaſures and ſenſual gratifications which they en-"joyed at the Pagan feſtivals, he granted them a permiſſion to indulge themſelves in the like "pleaſures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping, that, in proceſs of time, they "would return, of their own accord, to a more virtuous and regular courſe of life." There is no ſort of doubt, but that, by this permiſſion, GREGORY allowed the Chriſtians to dance, ſport, and feaſt, at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their reſpective feſtivals, and to do every thing which the Pagans were accuſtomed to do in their temples during the feaſts, celebrated in honour of their gods.

nature, as not to inſpire ideas, or encourage prejudices incompatible with juſt ſentiments of the great object of religious worſhip, and of the fundamental truths which God has imparted by reaſon and revelation to the human race. How far this rule has been diſregarded and violated, will appear too plainly in the progreſs of this hiſtory.]

Third reaſon. The abuſe of Jewiſh rites.

IV. A third cauſe of the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Chriſtian church, may be deduced from the abuſe of certain titles that diſtinguiſhed the ſacerdotal orders among the Jews. Every one knows that many terms uſed in the New Teſtament, to expreſs the different parts of the Chriſtian doctrine and worſhip, are borrowed from the Jewiſh law, or have a certain analogy with the rites and ceremonies inſtituted by MOSES. The Chriſtian doctors did not only imitate this analogical manner of ſpeaking, but they even extended it further than the apoſtles had done. And, though in this there was nothing worthy of reproach, yet the conſequences of this method of ſpeaking, became, through abuſe, detrimental to the purity of the goſpel. For, in proceſs of time, many aſſerted, whether through ignorance or artifice, is not eaſy to determine, that theſe forms of ſpeech were not *figurative*, but highly *proper*, and exactly ſuitable to the nature of the things they were deſigned to expreſs. The *biſhops*, by an innocent alluſion to the Jewiſh manner of ſpeaking, had been called *chief prieſts*; the *elders*, or preſbyters, had received the title of *prieſts*; and the *deacons* that of *levites*. But, in a little time, theſe titles were abuſed by an aſpiring clergy, who thought proper to claim the ſame rank and ſtation, the ſame rights and privileges that were conferred with thoſe titles upon the miniſters of religion under the Moſaic diſpenſation. Hence the riſe of *tithes*, *firſt fruits*, *ſplendid garments*, and many other circumſtances of external grandeur, by which eccleſiaſtics were eminently diſtinguiſhed. In like manner the compariſon of the Chriſtian *oblations*, with the Jewiſh *victims* and *ſacrifices*, produced a multitude of unneceſſary rites, and was the occaſion of introducing that erroneous notion of the *euchariſt*, which repreſents it as a *real ſacrifice*, and not merely as a commemoration of that great *offering*, that was once made upon the croſs for the ſins of mortals.

Fourth reaſon. The imitation of the heathen myſteries.

V. The profound reſpect that was paid to the Greek and Roman *myſteries*, and the extraordinary ſanctity that was attributed to them, was a further circumſtance that induced the Chriſtians to give their religion a *myſtic air*, in order to put it upon an equal foot, in point of dignity, with that of the Pagans. For this purpoſe, they gave the name of *myſteries* to the inſtitutions of the goſpel, and decorated particularly the holy ſacrament with that ſolemn title. They uſed in that ſacred inſtitution, as alſo in that of baptiſm, ſeveral of the terms employed in the heathen *myſteries*, and proceeded ſo far, at length, as even to adopt ſome of the rites and ceremonies of which theſe renowned *myſteries* conſiſted [o]. This imitation began in the eaſtern provinces; but after the time of ADRIAN, who firſt introduced the MYSTERIES among the

---

[o] See, for many examples of this, ISAAC CASAUBON, *Exercitat.* xvi. *in Annales Baronii*, p. 478, 9, &c. edit. Genev. 1654. TOLLIUS, *Inſign. itineris Italici Not.* p. 151. 163. SPANHEIM's Notes to his French tranſlation of JULIAN's *Cæſars*, p. 133, 134. CLARKSON *on Liturgies*, p. 36. 42, 43.

Latins [p], it was followed by the Chriſtians, who dwelt in the weſtern parts of the empire. A great part, therefore, of the ſervice of the church, in this century, had a certain air of the heathen myſteries, and reſembled them conſiderably in many particulars.

Fifth reaſon, The ſymbolic manner of teaching in uſe among the eaſtern nations.

VI. It may be yet further obſerved, that the cuſtom of teaching their religious doctrines by *images*, *actions*, *ſigns*, and other ſenſible repreſentations, which prevailed among the Egyptians, and, indeed, in almoſt all the eaſtern nations, was another cauſe of the increaſe of external rites in the church. As there were many perſons of narrow capacities, and whoſe comprehenſion ſcarcely extended beyond ſenſible objects, the Chriſtian doctors thought it adviſeable to inſtruct ſuch in the eſſential truths of the goſpel, by placing theſe truths, as it were, before their eyes, under ſenſible images. Thus they adminiſtred *milk* and *honey*, which was the ordinary food of infants, to ſuch as were newly received into the church, ſhewing them, by this ſign, that by their baptiſm they were born again, and were bound to manifeſt the ſimplicity and innocence of infants in their lives and converſations. Certain military rites were borrowed to expreſs the new and ſolemn engagements, by which Chriſtians attached themſelves to CHRIST as their leader and their chief; and the ancient ceremony of *manumiſſion* was uſed to ſignify the liberty of which they were made partakers, in conſequence of their redemption from the guilt and dominion of ſin, and their deliverance from the empire of the prince of darkneſs [q].

Sixth reaſon, Prejudices of converted Jews and Gentiles.

VII. If it be conſidered, in the laſt place, that the Chriſtians, who compoſed the church, were Jews and Heathens accuſtomed, from their birth, to various inſignificant ceremonies and ſuperſtitious rites; and if it be alſo conſidered, that ſuch a long courſe of cuſtom and education forms prejudices that are extremely obſtinate and difficult to be conquered, it will then appear that nothing leſs than a continued miracle could have totally prevented the entrance of all ſuperſtitious mixtures into the Chriſtian worſhip. A ſingle example will tend to the illuſtration of this matter. Before the coming of CHRIST, all the eaſtern nations performed divine worſhip with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the ſun diſplays his riſing beams. This cuſtom was founded upon a general opinion, that God, whoſe *eſſence* they looked upon to be *light*, and whom they conſidered as circumſcribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament, from whence he ſends forth the ſun, the bright image of his benignity and glory. They, who embraced the Chriſtian religion, rejected, indeed, this groſs error, but they retained the ancient and univerſal cuſtom of worſhiping towards the eaſt, which ſprung from it. Nor is that cuſtom aboliſhed even in our times, but ſtill prevails in a vaſt number of Chriſtian churches. From this ſame ſource aroſe various rites among the Jews, which many Chriſtians, eſpecially thoſe who live in the eaſtern countries, obſerve religiouſly at this very day [r].

---

[p] SPARTIAN. *Hadrian.* c. xiii. p. 15. edit. of Obrecht.

[q] See EDM. MERILLII *Obſervat.* lib. iii. cap. iii.

[r] See SPENCER, *De legibus ritualibus Hebræorum. Prolegom.* p. 9. edit. Cambridge.

Of the Chriſtian aſſemblies.

VIII. We ſhall take no more than a brief view of theſe rites and ceremonies, ſince a particular conſideration of them would lead us into endleſs diſcuſſions, and open a field too vaſt to be comprehended in ſuch a compendious hiſtory as we here give of the Chriſtian church. The firſt Chriſtians aſſembled for the purpoſes of divine worſhip, in *private houſes*, in *caves*, and in *vaults*, where the dead were buried. Their meetings were on the *firſt day of the week*, and, in ſome places, they aſſembled alſo upon the *ſeventh*, which was celebrated by the Jews. Many alſo obſerved the *fourth* day of the week, on which Christ was betrayed, and the *ſixth*, which was the day of his crucifixion. The hour of the day appointed, for holding theſe religious aſſemblies, varied according to the different times and circumſtances of the church; but it was generally in the evening after ſun-ſet, or in the morning before the dawn. During theſe ſacred meetings, prayers were repeated [s], the holy ſcriptures were publicly red, ſhort diſcourſes, upon the duties of Chriſtians, were addreſſed to the people, hymns were ſung, and a portion of the *oblations*, preſented by the faithful, was employed in the celebration of the Lord's ſupper, and the feaſts of charity.

Diſputes about the time of keeping Eaſter, or the paſchal feaſt.

IX. The Chriſtians, of this century, celebrated anniverſary feſtivals in commemoration of the death and reſurrection of Christ, and of the effuſion of the Holy Ghost upon the apoſtles. The day which was obſerved as the anniverſary of Christ's death, was called the *paſchal* day, or paſſover, becauſe it was looked upon to be the ſame with that on which the Jews celebrated the feaſt of that name. In the manner, however, of obſerving this ſolemn day, the Chriſtians, of the *Leſſer Aſia*, differed much from the reſt, and in a more eſpecial manner from thoſe of *Rome*. They both, indeed, faſted during the *great week* (ſo that was called in which Christ died) and afterwards celebrated, like the Jews, a ſacred feaſt, at which they diſtributed a paſchal lamb in memory of our Saviour's laſt ſupper. But the Aſiatic Chriſtians kept this feaſt on the fourteenth day of the firſt Jewiſh month, at the time that the Jews celebrated their paſſover, and, three days after, commemorated the reſurrection of the triumphant redeemer. They affirmed, that they had derived this cuſtom from the apoſtles John and Philip, and pleaded, moreover, in its behalf, the example of Christ himſelf, who held his *paſchal feaſt* on the ſame day that the Jews celebrated their *paſſover*. The weſtern churches obſerved a different method. They celebrated their *paſchal* feaſt on the night that preceded the anniverſary of Christ's reſurrection, and thus connected the commemoration of the Saviour's crucifixion, with that of his victory over death and the grave. Nor did they differ thus from the Aſiatics, without alleging alſo apoſtolic authority for what they did; for they pleaded that of St. Peter and St. Paul, as a juſtification of their conduct in this matter.

The occaſion of them, and their progreſs.

X. The Aſiatic rule for keeping the *paſchal feaſt*, was attended with two great inconviencies, to which the Chriſtians at *Alexandria* and *Rome*, and the whole weſtern churches, refuſed to ſubmit. For, in the firſt place, as the Aſiatics celebrated their feſtival the ſame day that CHRIST is ſaid to have ate the paſchal lamb with his diſciples, this occaſioned an inevitable interruption in the faſt of the *great week*, which the other churches looked upon as almoſt criminal, at leaſt, as highly indecent. Nor was this the only inconveniency ariſing from this rule; for as they celebrated the memory of CHRIST's reſurrection, preciſely the third day after their paſchal ſupper, it happened, for the moſt part, that this great feſtival (which afterwards was called, by the Latins, *paſcha*, and to which we give the name of Eaſter) was held on other days of the week than the *firſt*. This circumſtance was extremely diſpleaſing to, by far, the greateſt part of the Chriſtians, who thought it unlawful to celebrate the reſurrection of our Lord, on any day but *Sunday*, as that was the day on which this glorious event happened. Hence aroſe ſharp and vehement contentions between the Aſiatic and weſtern Chriſtians. About the middle of this century, during the reign of ANTONINUS PIUS, the venerable POLYCARP came to *Rome* to confer with ANICET, biſhop of that ſee, upon this matter, with a view to terminate the warm diſputes it had occaſioned. But this conference, though conducted with great decency and moderation, was without effect. POLYCARP and ANICET were only agreed in this, that the bonds of charity were not to be broken on account of this controverſy; but they continued, at the ſame time, each in their former ſentiments, nor could the Aſiatics be engaged by any arguments to alter the rule which they pretended to have received by tradition from St. JOHN [t].

---

[s] There is an excellent account given of theſe prayers, and of the Chriſtian worſhip in general, in Tertullian's *Apology*, ch. xxxix. which is one of the moſt noble productions of ancient times.

They prevail principally between the Aſiatics and Romans.

XI. Towards the concluſion of this century, VICTOR, biſhop of *Rome*, took it into his head to force the Aſiatic Chriſtians, by the pretended authority of his laws and decrees, to follow the rule which was obſerved by the weſtern churches in this matter. Accordingly, after having taken the advice of ſome foreign biſhops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Aſiatic prelates, commanding them to imitate the example of the weſtern Chriſtians with reſpect to the time of celebrating the feſtival of Eaſter. The Aſiatics anſwered this lordly ſummons by the pen of POLYCRATES, biſhop of *Epheſus*, who declared in their name, and that with great ſpirit and reſolution, that they would by no means depart, in this matter, from the cuſtom handed down to them by their anceſtors. Upon this, the thunder of excommunication began to roar. VICTOR, exaſperated by this reſolute anſwer of the Aſiatic biſhops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowſhip with the church of *Rome*. This excommunication, indeed, extended no further, nor could it cut off the Aſiatic biſhops from communion with the other churches, whoſe biſhops were far from approving the conduct of VICTOR [u]. The progreſs of this violent diſſenſion was ſtopped by the wiſe and moderate remonſtrances, which IRENÆUS, biſhop of *Lyons*, addreſſed to the Roman prelate upon this occaſion, in which he ſhewed him the imprudence and injuſtice of the ſtep he had taken, and alſo by the long letter which the Aſiatic Chriſtians wrote in their own juſtification. In conſequence therefore of this ceſſation of arms, the combatants retained each their own cuſtoms, until the fourth century, when the council of *Nice* aboliſhed that of the Aſiatics, and rendered the time of the celebration of Eaſter the ſame through all the Chriſtian churches [w].

---

[t] EUSEBIUS *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xiv. p. 127. and lib. v. cap. xxiv. p. 193.

[u] This whole affair furniſhes a ſtriking argument, among the multitude that may be drawn from eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, againſt the ſupremacy and univerſal authority of the biſhop of *Rome*.

The celebration of the Lord's ſupper.

XII. In theſe times, the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper was celebrated, for the moſt part, on Sundays, and the ceremonies obſerved upon that occaſion were ſuch as follow: A part of the bread and wine, which was preſented among the other *oblations* of the faithful, was ſeparated from the reſt, and conſecrated by the prayers of the biſhop. The wine was mixed with water, and the bread was divided into ſeveral portions. A part of the conſecrated bread and wine was carried to the ſick or abſent members of the church, as a teſtimony of fraternal love, ſent to them by the whole ſociety [x]. It appears by many and undoubted teſtimonies, that this holy rite was looked upon as eſſential to ſalvation; and when this is duly conſidered, we ſhall be leſs diſpoſed to cenſure, as erroneous, the opinion of thoſe who have affirmed that the Lord's ſupper was adminiſtred to infants during this century [y]. The *feaſts of charity*, that followed the celebration of the Lord's ſupper, have been mentioned already.

Baptiſm.

XIII. The ſacrament of *baptiſm* was adminiſtred publicly twice every year, at the feſtivals of Eaſter and Pentecoſt, or Whitſuntide [z], either by the *biſhop* or the *preſbyters*, in conſequence of his authorization and appointment. The perſons that were to be baptized, after that they had repeated the *Creed*, confeſſed and renounced their ſins, and particularly the *devil*, and his pompous allurements, were immerſed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a ſolemn invocation of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, according to the expreſs command of our Bleſſed Lord. After baptiſm, they received the *ſign of the croſs*, were *anointed*, and, by *prayers* and *impoſition of hands*, were ſolemnly commended to the mercy of God, and dedicated to his ſervice; in conſequence of which they received *milk* and *honey*, which concluded the ceremony [a]. The reaſons of this particular ritual coincide with what we have ſaid in general concerning the origin and cauſes of the multiplied ceremonies, that crept from time to time into the church.

Adult perſons were prepared for baptiſm by abſtinence, prayer, and other pious exerciſes. It was to anſwer for them that ſponſors or godfathers were

---

[(*w*) Dr. Mosheim, in a note here, refers us for an ampler account of this controverſy to his *Commentar. de rebus Chriſtianorum ante Conſtantinum M.* p. 435. He had ſaid in that work, that Faydit had perceived the error of the common opinion, concerning the diſputes that aroſe in the church about the time of keeping Eaſter. But here he retracts this encomium, and, after a ſecond reading of Faydit's book, finds himſelf obliged to declare, that that writer has entirely miſſed the true ſtate of the queſtion. See the account of this controverſy, that is given by the learned Heuman, in one of the treatiſes of his *Sylloge*, or collection of ſmall pieces.]

[x] Henricus Rixnerus, *De ritibus veterum Chriſtianorum, circa Euchariſtiam*, p. 155, &c.

[y] See Jo. Frid. Mayer. *Diſſ. de Euchariſtia Infantum*; as alſo Zornius *Hiſtor. Euchariſt. Infantum*, publiſhed at *Berlin*, 1736.

[z] See Wall's *Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm*; and Vicecome's *De ritibus Baptiſmi.*

[a] See Tertullian on Baptiſm.

ſirſt inſtituted, though they were afterwards admitted alſo in the baptiſm of infants [*b*].

CHAP. V.

Concerning the hereſies and diſſenſions that troubled the church during this century.

Diſſenſions in the church, occaſioned by the Jews.

I. AMONG the many ſects, which divided the Chriſtian church during this century, it is natural to mention, in the firſt place, that, which an attachment to the Moſaic law ſeparated from the reſt of their Chriſtian brethren. The firſt riſe of this ſect is placed under the reign of ADRIAN. For, when this emperor had, at length, razed *Jeruſalem*, entirely deſtroyed even its very foundations, and enacted laws of the ſevereſt kind againſt the whole body of the Jewiſh people; the greateſt part of the Chriſtians, who lived in *Paleſtine*, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews, abandoned entirely the Moſaic rites, and choſe a biſhop named MARK, a foreigner by nation, and conſequently an alien from the commonwealth of *Iſrael*. This ſtep was highly ſhocking to thoſe, whoſe attachment to the Moſaic rites was violent and invincible; and ſuch was the caſe of many. Theſe, therefore, ſeparated themſelves from the brethren, and founded at *Pera*, a country of *Paleſtine*, and in the neighbouring parts, particular aſſemblies, in which the law of MOSES maintained its primitive dignity, authority, and luſtre [*c*].

Origin of the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

II. This body of judaizing Chriſtians, which ſet CHRIST and MOSES upon an equal foot in point of authority, was afterwards divided into two ſects, extremely different both in their rites and in their opinions, and diſtinguiſhed by the names of Nazarenes and Ebionites. The former are not placed by the ancient Chriſtians in the heretical regiſter [*d*]; but the latter were conſidered as a ſect, whoſe tenets were deſtructive of the fundamental principles of the Chriſtian religion. Theſe ſects made uſe of a *goſpel*, or hiſtory of CHRIST, different from that which is received among us, and concerning which, there have been many diſputes among the learned [*e*]. The term Nazarenes was

---

[*b*] See GERH. a MASTRICHT, *De ſuſceptoribus infantium ex baptiſmo*; though he is of a different opinion in this matter, and thinks that *ſponſors* were not uſed in the baptiſm of adult perſons. See alſo WALL's *Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm.* [See moreover upon this ſubject, ISSAACI JUNDT *Arg. de Suſceptorum Baptiſmalium origine Commentatio*, publiſhed at *Straſburg* in the year 1755, of which an account may be ſeen in the *Biblioth. des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, tom. vi. part. i. p. 13.]

[*c*] Vid. SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Hiſt. Sacræ*, lib. ii. cap. xxxi. p. 245.

[*d*] EPIPHANIUS was the firſt writer who placed the Nazarenes in the liſt of heretics. He wrote in the fourth century, but is very far from being remarkable either for his fidelity or judgment.

[(*e*) This goſpel, which was called indiſcriminately the goſpel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews, is certainly the ſame with the goſpel of the Ebionites, the goſpel of the XII apoſtles, and is very probably that which St. PAUL refers to Galatians, ch. i. ver. 6. Dr. MOSHEIM refers his readers, for an account of this goſpel, to FABRITIUS, in his *Codex Apocryph. Nov. Teſt.* tom. i. p. 355, and to a work of his own, intitled, *Vindiciæ contra Tolandi Nazarenum*, p. 112. The reader will, however, find a ſtill more accurate and ſatisfactory account of this goſpel, in the firſt not originally the name of a ſect, but that which diſtinguiſhed the diſciples of Jesus in general. And as thoſe, whom the Greeks called Chriſtians, received the name of Nazarenes among the Jews, this latter name was not conſidered as a mark of ignominy or contempt. Thoſe indeed, who, after their ſeparation from their brethren, retained the title of Nazarenes, differed much from the true diſciples of Christ, to whom that name had been originally given: "They held, that Christ was born of a virgin, and was alſo in a *certain* "*manner* united to the divine nature; they refuſed to abandon the ceremonies "preſcribed by the law of Moses, but were far from attempting to impoſe "the obſervance of theſe ceremonies upon the Gentile Chriſtians; they re-"jected alſo all thoſe additions that were made to the Moſaic inſtitutions, by "the Phariſees and the doctors of the law [*f*];" and from hence we may eaſily ſee the reaſon why the greateſt part of the Chriſtians treated the Nazarenes with a more than ordinary degree of gentleneſs and forbearance.

Ebionites, their origin doubtful.

III. It is a doubtful matter from whence the Ebionites derived their name, whether from that of ſome of their principal doctors, or from their poverty [*g*]. One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that their ſentiments and doctrines were much more pernicious than thoſe of the Nazarenes [*h*]. For though they believed the celeſtial miſſion of Christ, and his participation of a divine nature, yet they regarded him as a man born of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary courſe of nature. They, moreover, aſſerted, that the ceremonial law, inſtituted by Moses, was not only obligatory upon the Jews, but alſo upon all others; and that the obſervance of it was eſſential to ſalvation. And as St. Paul had very different ſentiments from them, concerning the obligation of the ceremonial law, and had oppoſed the obſervance of it in the warmeſt manner, ſo of conſequence they held this apoſtle in abhorrence, and treated his writings with the utmoſt diſreſpect. Nor were they only attached to the rites inſtituted by Moses; they went ſtill further, and received, with an equal degree of veneration, the ſuperſtitions of their anceſtors, and the ceremonies and traditions which the Phariſees preſumptuouſly added to the law [*i*].

---

volume of the learned and judicious Mr. Jones's incomparable *Method of ſettling the Canonical Authority of the New Teſtament*.]

[*f*] See Mich. le Quien, *Adnot. ad Damaſcenum*, tom. i. p. 82, 83; as alſo a diſſertation of the ſame author, *De Nazarenis et eorum fide*, which is the ſeventh of thoſe that he has ſubjoined to his edition of the works of *Damaſcenus*.

[*g*] See Fabric. *ad Philoſtr. De Hæreſibus*, p. 81; as alſo Ittigius, *De Hæreſibus ævi Apoſtoloci*.

[(*h*) The learned Mr. Jones looked upon theſe two ſects as differing very little from one another. He attributes to them both, much the ſame doctrines, and alledges that the Ebionites had only made ſome ſmall additions to the old Nazarene ſyſtem. See the *New and full Method of ſettling the Canonical Authority of the New Teſtament*, vol. i. p. 385.]

[*i*] Irenæus, lib. i. *Contra Hæreſ.* cap. xxvi. p. 105. edit. Maſſueti. Epiphanius gives a large account of the Ebionites, *Hæreſ.* xxx. But he deſerves little credit, ſince he confeſſes (§ 3. p. 127. and § 4. p. 141.) that he had confounded the Sampſæans and Elceſaites with the Ebionites, and alſo acknowledges, that the firſt Ebionites were ſtrangers to the errors with which he charges them.

Sects that aroſe from the oriental philoſophy.

IV. Theſe obſcure and unfrequented heretical aſſemblies were very little detrimental to the Chriſtian cauſe, which ſuffered much more from thoſe ſects, whoſe leaders explained the doctrines of Chriſtianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of the oriental philoſophy concerning the origin of evil. Thoſe oriental doctors, who, before this century, had lived in the greateſt obſcurity, came forth from their retreat under the reign of ADRIAN [k], expoſed themſelves to public view, and gathered together, in various provinces, aſſemblies, whoſe numbers were very conſiderable. The ancient records mention a great number of theſe demi-chriſtian ſects, many of which are no further known than by their diſtinguiſhing names, which, perhaps, is the only circumſtance in which they differ from each other. One diviſion, however, of theſe oriental Chriſtians, may be conſidered as real and important, ſince the two branches it produced were vaſtly ſuperior to the reſt in reputation, and made more noiſe in the world, than the other multiplied ſubdiviſions of this pernicious ſect. Of this famous diviſion, one branch, which aroſe in *Aſia*, preſerved the oriental doctrine concerning the origin of the world, unmixed with other ſentiments and opinions; while the other, which was formed in *Egypt*, made a motley mixture of this philoſophy, with the tenets and prodigies adopted in the religious ſyſtem of that ſuperſtitious country. The doctrine of the former ſurpaſſed in ſimplicity and perſpicuity that of the latter, which conſiſted of a vaſt variety of parts, ſo artfully combined, that the explication of them became a matter of much difficulty.

The Aſiatic.

Elxai, and his followers.

V. Among the doctors of the Aſiatic branch, the firſt place is due to ELXAI, a Jew, who, during the reign of TRAJAN, is ſaid to have formed the ſect of the Elceſaites. This heretic, though a Jew, attached to the worſhip of one God, and full of veneration for MOSES, corrupted, nevertheleſs, the religion of his anceſtors, by blending with it a multitude of fictions drawn from the oriental philoſophy; pretending alſo, after the example of the Eſſenes, to give a rational explication of the law of MOSES, he reduced it to a mere allegory. It is, at the ſame time, proper to obſerve, that ſome have doubted, whether the Elceſaites are to be reckoned among the Chriſtian, or the Jewiſh ſects; and EPIPHANIUS, who was acquainted with a certain production of ELXAI, expreſſes his uncertainty in this matter. ELXAI, indeed, in that book mentions CHRIST with the higheſt encomiums, without, however, adding any circumſtance from whence it might be concluded with certainty, that JESUS of Nazareth was the CHRIST of whom he ſpoke [l].

Saturninus, his extravagant fancies.

VI. If then ELXAI be improperly placed among the leaders of the ſect now under conſideration, we may place at its head SATURNINUS of *Antioch*, who is one of the firſt Gnoſtic chiefs mentioned in hiſtory. He held the doctrine of *two principles*, from whence proceeded all things; the *one a wiſe* and *benevolent deity*; and the other *matter*, *a principle eſſentially evil*, and which he ſuppoſed under the ſuperintendence of a certain intelligence of a malignant nature. “The world and its firſt inhabitants were (according to the ſyſtem of this raving philoſopher) created by ſeven angels, which preſided over the ſeven planets. This work was carried on without the knowledge of the *benevolent deity*, and in oppoſition to the will of the *material principle*. The former, however, beheld it with approbation, and honoured it with ſeveral marks of his beneficence. He endowed with rational ſouls the beings, who inhabited this new ſyſtem, to whom their creators had imparted nothing more than the mere animal life; and having divided the world into ſeven parts, he diſtributed them among the ſeven *angelic architects*, one of whom was the god of the Jews; and reſerved to himſelf the ſupreme empire over all. To theſe creatures, whom the *benevolent principle* had endowed with reaſonable ſouls, and with diſpoſitions that led to goodneſs and virtue, the *evil being*, to maintain his empire, added another kind, whom he formed of a wicked and malignant character; and hence the difference we ſee among men. When the creators of the world fell from their allegiance to the ſupreme deity, GOD ſent from heaven, into our globe, a *reſtorer of order*, whoſe name was CHRIST. This divine conqueror came cloathed with a corporeal appearance, but not with a *real* body; he came to deſtroy the empire of the *material principle*, and to point out to virtuous ſouls the way by which they muſt return to God. This way is beſet with difficulties and ſufferings; ſince thoſe ſouls, who propoſe returning to the ſupreme being, after the diſſolution of this mortal body, muſt abſtain from wine, fleſh, wedlock, and, in ſhort, from every thing that tends to ſenſual gratification, or even bodily refreſhment." SATURNINUS taught theſe extravagant doctrines in *Syria*, but principally at *Antioch*, and drew after him many diſciples by the pompous appearance of an extraordinary virtue [m].

---

[k] CLEMENS ALEX. *Stromat.* lib. viii. cap. xvii. p. 898. CYPRIANUS epiſt. lxxv.

[l] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xxxviii. p. 234. EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreſ.* xix. § 3. p. 41. THEODORETUS, *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. ii. cap. vii. p. 221.

Cerdo.
Marcion.

VII. CERDO the Syrian, and MARCION, ſon to the biſhop of Pontus, belong alſo to the Aſiatic ſect, though they began to eſtabliſh their doctrine at *Rome*, and having given a turn ſomewhat different to the oriental ſuperſtition, may themſelves be conſidered as the heads of a new ſect which bears their names, amidſt the obſcurity and doubts that render ſo uncertain the hiſtory of theſe two men, the following fact is inconteſtable, *viz.* That CERDO had been ſpreading his doctrine at *Rome* before the arrival of MARCION there; and that the latter having, through his own miſconduct, forfeited a place, to which he aſpired in the church of *Rome*, attached himſelf, through reſentment, to the impoſtor CERDO, and propagated his impious doctrines with an aſtoniſhing ſucceſs throughout the world. "After the example of the oriental doctors, they held the exiſtence of *two principles*, the one perfectly *good*; and the other perfectly *evil*. Between theſe, they imagined an *intermediate kind of deity*, neither perfectly good, nor perfectly evil, but *of a mixed nature* (ſo MARCION expreſſes it) and ſo far juſt and powerful, as to adminiſter rewards and inflict puniſhments. This *middle deity* is the creator of this inferior world, and the *God and legiſlator of the Jewiſh nation*; he wages perpetual war upon the *evil principle*, and both the one and the other aſpire to the place of the ſupreme being, and ambitiouſly attempt ſubjecting to their authority all the inhabitants of the world. The Jews are the ſubjects of that powerful *genius* who formed this globe: the other nations, who worſhip a variety of gods, are under the empire of the *evil principle*. Both theſe conflicting powers exerciſe oppreſſions upon rational and immortal ſouls, and keep them in a tedious and miſerable captivity. Therefore the Supreme God, in order to terminate this war, and to deliver from their bondage thoſe ſouls whoſe origin is celeſtial and divine, ſent to the Jews a *being* moſt like unto himſelf, even his ſon Jesus Christ, cloathed with a certain ſhadowy reſemblance of a body, that thus he might be viſible to mortal eyes. The commiſſion of this celeſtial meſſenger was to deſtroy the empire both of the *evil principle*, and of the *author of this world*, and to bring back wandring ſouls to God. On this account, he was attacked with inexpreſſible violence and fury by the *prince of darkneſs*, and by the *God of the Jews*, but without effect, ſince, having a body only in appearance, he was thereby rendered incapable of ſuffering. Thoſe who follow the ſacred directions of this celeſtial conductor, mortify the body by faſtings and auſterities, call off their minds from the allurements of ſenſe, and, renouncing the precepts of the god of the Jews, and of the prince of darkneſs, turn their eyes towards the ſupreme being, ſhall, after death, aſcend to the manſions of felicity and perfection." In conſequence of all this, the rule of manners, which Marcion preſcribed to his followers, was exceſſively auſtere, containing an expreſs prohibition of wedlock, of the uſe of wine, fleſh, and of all the external comforts of life. Notwithſtanding the rigour of this ſevere diſcipline, great numbers embraced the doctrines of Marcion, of whom Lucan, or Lucian, Severus, Blastes, and principally Apelles, are ſaid to have varied, in ſome things, from the opinions of their maſter, and to have formed new ſects [n].

---

[m] IRENÆUS, lib. i. c. xxiv. EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. vii. THEODORET. *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. i. cap. ii. EPIPHAN. *Hæreſ.* xxiii. THEODORET. *Fab. Hær.* lib. i. cap. ii.

Bardeſanes.

VIII. Bardesanes and Tatian are commonly ſuppoſed to have been of the ſchool of Valentine the Egyptian. But this notion is entirely without foundation, ſince their doctrine differs in many things from that of the Valentinians, approaching nearer to that of the oriental philoſophy concerning the *two principles*. Bardesanes, native of *Edeſſa*, was a man of a very acute genius, and acquired a ſhining reputation by his writings, which were in great number, and valuable for the profound erudition they contained. Seduced by the fantaſtic charms of the oriental philoſophy, he adopted it with zeal, but, at the ſame time, with certain modifications, that rendered his ſyſtem leſs extravagant, than that of the Marcionites, againſt whom he wrote a very learned treatiſe. The ſum of his doctrine is as follows: "There is a Supreme God, pure and benevolent, abſolutely free from all evil and imperfection; and there is alſo a *prince of darkneſs*, the fountain of all evil, diſorder, and miſery. The Supreme God created the world without any mixture of evil in its compoſition; he gave exiſtence alſo to its inhabitants,

---

[n] See Irenæus, Epiphanius, and particularly Tertullian's *Five Books againſt the Marcionites*, with his *Poem againſt* Marcion, and the *Dialogue againſt the Marcionites*, which is generally aſcribed to Origen. See all Tillemont, *Memoires*, and Beausobre's *Hiſtoire du Manicheiſme*, tom. ii. p. 69.

“who came out of his forming hand, pure and incorrupt, endued with ſubtle ethereal bodies and ſpirits of a celeſtial nature. But when, in proceſs of time, the *prince of darkneſs* had enticed men to ſin, then the SUPREME GOD permitted them to fall into ſluggiſh and groſs bodies, formed of corrupt matter by the *evil principle*; he permitted alſo the depravation and diſorder which this malignant being introduced both into the natural and the moral world, deſigning, by this permiſſion, to puniſh the degeneracy and rebellion of an apoſtate race; and hence proceeds the perpetual conflict between reaſon and paſſion in the mind of man. It was on this account, that JESUS deſcended from the upper regions, cloathed not with a real, but with a celeſtial and aërial body, and taught mankind to ſubdue that body of corruption which they carry about with them in this mortal life; and, by *abſtinence*, *faſting*, and *contemplation*, to diſengage themſelves from the ſervitude and dominion of that *malignant matter*, which chained down the ſoul to low and ignoble purſuits. Thoſe, who hear the voice of this divine inſtructor, and ſubmit themſelves to his diſcipline, ſhall, after the diſſolution of this terreſtrial body, mount up to the manſions of felicity, cloathed with æthereal vehicles, or celeſtial bodies.” Such was the doctrine of BARDESANES, who afterwards abandoned the chimerical part of this ſyſtem, and returned to a better mind; though his ſect ſubſiſted a long time in *Syria* [o].

Tatian.

IX. TATIAN, by birth an Aſſyrian, and a diſciple of JUSTIN martyr, is more diſtinguiſhed, by the ancient writers, on account of his genius and learning, and the exceſſive and incredible auſterity of his life and manners, than for any remarkable errors or opinions which he taught his followers. It appears, however, from the teſtimony of credible writers, that TATIAN looked upon *matter* as the fountain of all evil, and therefore recommended, in a particular manner, the mortification of the body; that he diſtinguiſhed the creator of the world from the ſupreme being; denied the reality of CHRIST's body; and corrupted the Chriſtian religion with ſeveral other tenets of the oriental philoſophy. He had a great number of followers, who were, after him, called Tatianiſts [p], but were, nevertheleſs, more frequently diſtinguiſhed from other ſects by names relative to the auſterity of their manners. For, as they rejected, with a ſort of horror, all the comforts and conveniencies of life, and abſtained from wine with ſuch a rigorous obſtinacy, as to uſe nothing but water even at the celebration of the Lord's ſupper; as they macerated their bodies by continual faſtings, and lived a ſevere life of celibacy and abſtinence, ſo they were called Encratites *, Hydroparaſtates †, and Apotactites ‡.

* Or temperate.
† Or drinkers of water.
‡ Renouncers.

---

[o] See the writers that give accounts of the ancient hereſies, as alſo EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xxx. p. 151. ORIGEN. *Dial. contra Marcionitas*, § 3. p. 70. edit. Wetſtenii. FRID. STRUNZII, *Hiſt. Bardeſanis*, &c. BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſt. du Manich.* vol. ii. p. 128.

[p] We have yet remaining of the writings of TATIAN, an *Oration* addreſſed to the Greeks. As to his opinions, they may be gathered from CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, *Stromat.* lib. iii. p. 460. EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreſ.* xlvi. cap. i. p. 391. ORIGEN. *De oratione*, cap. xiii. p. 77. of the *Oxford* edition. None, however, of the ancients have written profeſſedly concerning the doctrines of TATIAN.

The peculiar ſentiments of the Egyptian Gnoſtics.

X. Hitherto, we have only conſidered the doctrine of the Aſiatic Gnoſtics. Thoſe of the Egyptian branch differ from them in general in this, that they blended into one maſs the oriental philoſophy and the Egyptian theology; the former of which the Aſiatics preſerved unmixed in its original ſimplicity. The Egyptian were, moreover, particularly diſtinguiſhed from the Aſiatic Gnoſtics, by the following difference in their religious ſyſtem, *viz.* 1. That, though beſides the exiſtence of a *deity*, they maintained that alſo of an *eternal matter*, endued with life and motion, yet they did not acknowledge an *eternal principle of darkneſs*, or the evil principle of the Perſians. 2. They ſuppoſed, that our Bleſſed Saviour was a compound of two perſons, of the man JESUS, and of CHRIST the ſon of God; that the divine nature entered into the man JESUS, when he was baptized by JOHN in the river *Jordan*, and departed from him when he was ſeized by the Jews. 3. They attributed to CHRIST a real, not an imaginary body; though it muſt be confeſſed, that they were much divided in their ſentiments on this head. 4. Their diſcipline, with reſpect to life and manners, was much leſs ſevere than that of the Aſiatic ſect, and ſeems, in ſome points, to have been favourable to the corruption and paſſions of men.

Baſilides.

XI. BASILIDES has generally obtained the firſt place among the Egyptian Gnoſtics. "He acknowledged the exiſtence of one Supreme God, perfect
" in goodneſs and wiſdom, who produced from his own ſubſtance ſeven
" beings, or æons, of a moſt excellent nature. Two of theſe æons, called
" *Dynamis* and *Sophia* (i. e. *power* and *wiſdom*) engendered the angels of the
" higheſt order. Theſe angels formed an heaven for their habitation, and
" brought forth other angelic beings, of a nature ſomewhat inferior to their
" own. Many other generations of angels followed theſe, new heavens were
" alſo created, until the number of angelic orders, and of their reſpective
" heavens, amounted to *three hundred and ſixty-five*, and thus equalled the
" days of the year. All theſe are under the empire of an omnipotent Lord,
" whom BASILIDES called *Abraxas*." This word (which was certainly in uſe among the Egyptians before his time) contains numeral letters to the amount of 365, and thereby expreſſes the number of heavens and angelic orders abovementioned [q]. " The inhabitants of the loweſt heavens, which touched

---

[q] We have remaining a great number of gems, and receive more from *Egypt* from time to time, on which, beſide other figures of Egyptian taſte, we find the word ABRAXAS engraven. See, for this purpoſe, a work intitled, MACARII *Abraxas*, *ſeu de gemmis Baſilidianis diſquiſitio*, which was publiſhed at *Antwerp*, with ſeveral improvements by JO. CHIFLETIUS, in 4to, 1657. See alſo MONTFAUCON, *Palæograph. Græc.* lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 177. All theſe gems are ſuppoſed to come from BASILIDES, and therefore bear his name. Moſt of them, however, contain the marks of a ſuperſtition too groſs to be attributed even to an Half-chriſtian, and bear alſo emblematic characters of the Egyptian theology. It is not, therefore, juſt to attribute them all to BASILIDES (who, though erroneous in many of his opinions, was yet a follower of CHRIST) but ſuch of them only as carry ſome mark of the Chriſtian doctrine and diſcipline.—There is no doubt, but that the old Egyptian word ABRAXAS was appropriated to the governor or lord of the heavens, and that BASILIDES, having learned it from the philoſophy of his nation, retained it in his religious ſyſtem. See BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſt. du Manicheiſm*, vol. ii. p. 51. and alſo JO. BAPT. PASSERI, in his *Diſſert. de gemmis Baſilidianis*, which makes a part of that ſplendid work which he publiſhed at *Florence* 1750, *De gemmis ſtelliferis*, tom. ii. p. 221. See alſo the ſentiments of the learned JABLONSKI, concerning the ſignification of the word ABRAXAS, as

“upon the borders of the eternal, malignant, and ſelf-animated *matter*, conceived the deſign of forming a world from that confuſed maſs, and of creating an order of beings to people it. This deſign was carried into execution, and was approved by the Supreme God, who, to the animal life, with which only the inhabitants of this new world were at firſt endowed, added a reaſonable ſoul, giving, at the ſame time, to the angels, the empire over them.”

The enormous errors of his ſyſtem.

XII. “Theſe angelic beings, advanced to the government of the world which they had created, fell, by degrees, from their original purity, and manifeſted ſoon the fatal marks of their depravity and corruption. They not only endeavoured to efface in the minds of men the knowledge of the ſupreme being, that they might be worſhiped in his ſtead, but alſo began to war againſt one another, with an ambitious view to enlarge, every one, the bounds of his reſpective dominion. The moſt arrogant and turbulent of all theſe angelic ſpirits, was that, which preſided over the Jewiſh nation. Hence the Supreme God, beholding with compaſſion the miſerable ſtate of rational beings, who, groaned under the conteſts of theſe jarring powers, ſent from heaven his ſon Nus, or Christ, the chief of the *æons*, that, joined in a ſubſtantial union with the man Jesus, he might reſtore the knowledge of the Supreme God, deſtroy the empire of thoſe angelic natures which preſided over the world, and particularly that of the arrogant leader of the Jewiſh people. The god of the Jews, alarmed at this, ſent forth his miniſters to ſeize the man Jesus, and put him to death. They executed his commands, but their cruelty could not extend to Christ, againſt whom their efforts were vain [r]. Thoſe ſouls, who obey the precepts of the ſon of God, ſhall, after the diſſolution of their mortal frame, aſcend to the father, while their bodies return to the corrupt maſs of matter from whence they were formed. Diſobedient ſpirits, on the contrary, ſhall paſs ſucceſſively into other bodies.”

The moral doctrine of Baſilides.

XIII. The doctrine of Basilides, in point of morals, if we may credit the accounts of moſt ancient writers, was favourable to the luſts and paſſions of mankind, and permitted the practice of all ſorts of wickedneſs. But thoſe, whoſe teſtimonies are the moſt worthy of regard, give a quite different account of this teacher, and repreſent him as recommending the practice of virtue and

---

they are delivered in a diſſertation inſerted in the ſeventh volume of the *Miſcell.* Leips. *Nova.* Passerius affirms, that none of theſe gems relate to Basilides, but that they concern only magicians, *i. e.* ſorcerers, fortune-tellers, and ſuch like adventurers. Here, however, this learned man ſeems to go too far, ſince he himſelf acknowledges (pag. 225.) that *he had ſometimes found, on theſe gems, veſtiges of the errors of* Basilides. Theſe famous monuments ſtand yet in need of an interpreter, but of ſuch a one as can join circumſpection to diligence and erudition.

[r] Many of the ancients have, upon the authority of Irenæus, accuſed Basilides of denying the reality of Christ's body, and of maintaining that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in his ſtead. But this accuſation is entirely groundleſs, as may be ſeen by conſulting the *Commentar. de rebus Chriſtian. ante Conſtant.* p. 354, &c. &c. where it is demonſtrated, that Basilides conſidered the divine Saviour as compounded of the man Jesus, and Christ the ſon of God. It may be indeed, that ſome of the diſciples of Basilides entertained the opinion that is here unjuſtly attributed to their maſter.

piety in the ſtrongeſt manner, and as having condemned not only the actual commiſſion of iniquity, but even every inward propenſity of the mind to a vitious conduct. It is true, there were, in his precepts relating to the conduct of life, ſome things which gave great offence to all true Chriſtians. For he affirmed it to be lawful for them to conceal their religion, to deny CHRIST, when their lives were in danger, and to partake of the feaſts of the Gentiles that were inſtituted in conſequence of the ſacrifices offered to idols. He endeavoured alſo to diminiſh the glory of thoſe who ſuffered martyrdom for the cauſe of CHRIST, impiouſly maintained, that they were more heinous ſinners than others, and that their ſufferings were to be looked upon as a puniſhment inflicted upon them by the divine juſtice. Though he was led into this enormous error, by an abſurd notion that all the calamities of this life were of a penal nature, and that men never ſuffered but in conſequence of their iniquities, yet this rendered his principles greatly ſuſpected, and the irregular lives of ſome of his diſciples ſeemed to juſtify the unfavourable opinion that was entertained concerning their maſter [*s*].

Carpocrates.

XIV. But whatever may be ſaid of BASILIDES, it is certain, that he was far ſurpaſſed in impiety by CARPOCRATES, who was alſo of *Alexandria*, and who carried the Gnoſtic blaſphemies to a more enormous degree of extravagance, than they had ever been brought by any of that ſect. His philoſophical tenets agree, in general, with thoſe of the Egyptian Gnoſtics. He acknowledged the exiſtence of a SUPREME GOD, and of the *æons* derived from him by ſucceſſive generations. He maintained the eternity of a *corrupt matter*, and the creation of the world from thence by angelic powers, as alſo the divine origin of ſouls unhappily impriſoned in mortal bodies, *&c.* But beſide theſe, he propagated other ſentiments and maxims of a horrid kind. He aſſerted that JESUS was born of JOSEPH and MARY, according to the ordinary courſe of nature, and was diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of mankind by nothing but his ſuperior fortitude and greatneſs of ſoul. His doctrine alſo, with reſpect to practice, was licentious in the higheſt degree; for he not only allowed his diſciples a full liberty to ſin, but recommended to them a vitious courſe of life, as a matter both of obligation and neceſſity, aſſerting, that eternal ſalvation was only attainable by thoſe who had committed all ſorts of crimes, and had daringly filled up the meaſure of iniquity. It is almoſt incredible, that one who maintained the exiſtence of a ſupreme being, who acknowledged CHRIST as the Saviour of mankind, could entertain ſuch monſtrous opinions as theſe. One would infer, indeed, from certain tenets of CARPOCRATES, that he adopted the common doctrine of the Gnoſtics concerning CHRIST, and acknowledged alſo the laws which this divine Saviour impoſed upon his diſciples. But notwithſtanding this, it is beyond all doubt, that the precepts and opinions of this Gnoſtic are full of impiety; ſince he held that luſts and paſſions, being implanted in our nature by God himſelf, were conſequently void of guilt, and had nothing criminal in them; that all actions were indifferent in their own nature, and were rendered good or evil only by the opinions of men, or by the laws of the ſtate; that it was the will of God, that all things ſhould be poſſeſſed in common, the female ſex not excepted, but that human laws, by an arbitrary tyranny, branded thoſe as robbers and adulterers, who only uſed their natural rights. It is eaſy to perceive, that, by theſe tenets, all the principles of virtue were deſtroyed, and a door opened to the moſt horrid licentiouſneſs, and to the moſt profligate and enormous wickedneſs [t].

[*s*] For a further account of BASILIDES, the reader may conſult REN. MASSUET, *Diſſert. in Irenæum*, and BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſt. du Manicheiſme*, vol. ii. p. 8.

Valentine.

XV. VALENTINE, who was likewiſe an Egyptian by birth, was eminently diſtinguiſhed from all his brethren by the extent of his fame, and the multitude of his followers. His ſect, which took riſe at *Rome*, grew up to a ſtate of conſiſtence and vigour in the iſle of *Cyprus*, and ſpred itſelf through *Aſia*, *Afric*, and *Europe*, with an amazing rapidity. The principles of VALENTINE were, generally ſpeaking, the ſame with thoſe of the Gnoſtics, whoſe name he aſſumed, yet in many things he entertained opinions that were particular to himſelf. " He placed, for inſtance, in the *pleroma* (ſo the Gnoſtics called " the habitation of the deity) thirty *æons*, of which the one half were male, " and the other female. To theſe he added four others, which were of " neither ſex, *viz. Horus*, who guarded the borders of the *pleroma*, CHRIST, " *the Holy Ghoſt*, and JESUS. The youngeſt of the æons, called *Sophia* (i. e. " wiſdom) conceived an ardent deſire of comprehending the nature of the " SUPREME BEING, and, by the force of this propenſity, brought forth a " daughter, named *Achamoth*. *Achamoth*, being exiled from the *pleroma*, fell " down into the rude and undigeſted maſs of matter, to which ſhe gave a certain arrangement; and, by the aſſiſtance of JESUS, produced the *demiurge*, " the lord and creator of all things. This *demiurge* ſeparated the ſubtle or " *animal* matter from that of the groſſer, or more *terreſtrial* kind; out of the " former he created the ſuperior world, or the viſible heavens; and out of " the latter he formed the inferior world, or this terraqueous globe. He " alſo made man, in whoſe compoſition the ſubtle and alſo the groſſer matter " were both united, and that in equal portions; but *Achamoth*, the mother of " *demiurge*, added to theſe two ſubſtances, of which the human race was " formed, *a ſpiritual and celeſtial ſubſtance*." This is the ſum of that intricate and tedious fable, that the extravagant brain of VALENTINE impoſed upon the world for a ſyſtem of religious philoſophy; and from this it appears, that, though he explained the origin of the world and of the human race in a more ſubtle manner than the other Gnoſtics, yet he did not differ from them in reality. His imagination was more wild and inventive than that of his brethren, and this is manifeſt in the whole of his doctrine, which is no more than gnoſticiſm, ſet out with ſome ſupernumerary fringes, as will further appear from what follows.

His idle dreams.

XVI. " The creator of this world, according to VALENTINE, arrived, by " degrees, to that pitch of arrogance, that he either imagined himſelf to be " God alone, or, at leaſt, was deſirous that mankind ſhould conſider him as " ſuch. For this purpoſe, he ſent forth prophets to the Jewiſh nation to " declare his claim to the honour that is due to the ſupreme being, and in

---

[t] See IREN. *Contra Hæreſ.* ch. xxv. CLEMENS ALEX. *Stromata*, lib. iii. p. 511.

“ this alſo the other angels that preſide over the different parts of the univerſe immediately ſet themſelves to imitate his ambition. To chaſtiſe this lawleſs arrogance of *demiurge*, and to illuminate the minds of rational beings with the knowledge of the true and ſupreme deity, CHRIST appeared upon earth; compoſed of an animal and ſpiritual ſubſtance, and cloathed, moreover, with an aërial body. This Redeemer, in deſcending upon earth, paſſed through the womb of MARY, as the pure water flows through the untainted conduit. JESUS, one of the ſupreme *æons*, was ſubſtantially united to him, when he was baptized by JOHN in the waters of *Jordan*. The creator of this world, when he perceived that the foundations of his empire were ſhaken by this divine man, cauſed him to be apprehended and nailed to the croſs. But before CHRIST ſubmitted to this puniſhment, not only JESUS the ſon of God, but alſo the rational ſoul of CHRIST aſcended up on high, ſo that only the animal ſoul and the etherial body ſuffered crucifixion. Thoſe, who, abandoning the ſervice of falſe deities and the worſhip of the God of the Jews, live according to the precepts of CHRIST, and ſubmit the animal and ſenſual ſoul to the diſcipline of reaſon, ſhall be truly happy: their rational and alſo their ſenſual ſouls ſhall aſcend to thoſe glorious ſeats of bliſs which border on the *pleroma*; and when all the parts of the divine nature, or all ſouls are purified thoroughly and ſeparated from *matter*, then a raging fire, let looſe from its priſon, ſhall ſpred its flames throughout the univerſe, and diſſolve the frame of this corporeal world.” Such is the doctrine of VALENTINE and the Gnoſtics; ſuch alſo are the tenets of the oriental philoſophy, and they may be ſummed up in the following propoſitions: *This world is a compound of good and evil. Whatever is good in it, comes down from the Supreme God, the father of lights, and to him it ſhall return: and then the world ſhall be entirely deſtroyed* [u].

Various ſects of the Valentinians. The greater.

XVII. We learn from ancient writers, that the ſect of the Valentinians was divided into many branches. One of theſe was the ſect of the Ptolemaites, ſo called from their chief Ptolemy, who differed, in opinion, from his maſter VALENTINE, with reſpect both to the number and nature of the *æons*. Another of theſe was the ſect of the Secundians, whoſe chief SECUNDUS, one of the principal followers of VALENTINE, maintained the doctrine of two eternal principles, *viz. light* and *darkneſs*, from whence aroſe the good and the evil that are obſervable in the univerſe. From the ſame ſource aroſe the ſect of HERACLEON, from whoſe writings CLEMENS and ORIGEN have made many extracts; as alſo that of the Marcoſians, whoſe leaders MARK and COLOBARSUS added many abſurd fictions to thoſe of VALENTINE; though it is certain, at the ſame time, that many errors were attributed to them, which they did not maintain [*w*]. I omit the mention of ſome other ſects, to which the Valentinian hereſy is ſaid to have given riſe. Whether, in reality, they all ſprung from this ſource, is a queſtion of a very doubtful kind, eſpecially if we conſider the errors into which the ancients have fallen, in tracing out the origin of the various ſects that divided the church [*x*].

---

[u] It is proper to obſerve, for the information of thoſe who deſire a more copious account of the Valentinian hereſy, that almoſt all the ancient writers have written upon this ſubject, eſpecially IRENÆUS, *Libro primo contra Hæreſ.* TERTULLIAN, in a particular treatiſe upon that matter; CLEMENS ALEX. &c. Among the moderns ſee JO. FRANC. BUDDÆUS, *Diſſert. de hæreſi Valentiniana*, in his introduction to his hiſtory of the Hebrew philoſophers, which diſſertation gave occaſion to many diſputes concerning the origin of this hereſy. Some of the moderns have endeavoured to reconcile, with reaſon, this obſcure and abſurd doctrine of the Valentinians. See, for this purpoſe, the following authors: SOUVERAIN *Platoniſme devoilé*, ch. viii. p. 68. CAMP. VITRINGA, *Obſerv. Sacr.* lib. i. cap. ii. p. 131. BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſtoire du Manicheiſme*, p. 548. JAC. BASNAGE, *Hiſt. des Juifs*, tom. iii. p. 729. PETR. FAYDIT, *Eclairciſſemens ſur l'Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. des deux premiers Siecles.* How vain all ſuch endeavours are, might eaſily be ſhewn; nay, VALENTINE himſelf has determined the matter, by acknowledging that his doctrine is abſolutely and entirely different from that of other Chriſtians.

The leſs conſiderable.

XVIII. It is not neceſſary to take any particular notice of the more obſcure and leſs conſiderable of the Gnoſtic ſects, of which the ancient writers ſcarcely mention any thing but the name, and one or two of their diſtinguiſhing tenets. Such were the Adamites, who are ſaid to have profeſſed an exact imitation of the primitive ſtate of innocence; the Cainites, who treated as ſaints with the utmoſt marks of admiration and reſpect, CAIN, CORAH, DATHAN, the inhabitants of SODOM, and even the traitor JUDAS. Such alſo were the Abelites, who contracted the bonds of matrimony, but neglected to fulfil its principal end, even the procreation of offspring; the Sethites, who honoured SETH in a particular manner, and looked upon him as the ſame perſon with CHRIST; the Florinians, who had FLORINUS and BASTUS for their chiefs [*y*], and ſeveral others. It is highly probable, that the ancient doctors, deceived by the variety of names that diſtinguiſhed the heretics, may with too much precipitation have divided one ſect into many; nay, it may be further queſtioned, whether they have, at all times, repreſented accurately the nature and true meaning of ſeveral opinions concerning which they have written.

Ophites.

XIX. The Ophites, or Serpentinians, a ridiculous ſort of heretics, who had for their leader a man called EUPHRATES, deſerve not the loweſt place among the Egyptian Gnoſtics. This ſect, which had its origin among the Jews, was of a more ancient date than the Chriſtian religion. A part of its followers embraced the goſpel, while the other retained their primitive ſuperſtition, and from hence aroſe the diviſion of the Ophites into Chriſtian and Anti-chriſtian. The Chriſtian Ophites entertained almoſt the ſame fantaſtic opinions, that were held by the other Egyptian Gnoſtics, concerning the *æons*, the *eternal matter*, the *creation of the world* in oppoſition to the will of

---

[(*w*) MARK did not certainly entertain all the opinions that are attributed to him. Thoſe however, which we are certain that he adopted, are ſufficient to convince us that he was out of his ſenſes. He maintained, among other crude fancies, that the *plenitude* and *perfection* of truth reſided in the Greek *alphabet*; and alleges that, as the reaſon why JESUS CHRIST was called the *Alpha* and the *Omega*.]

[*x*] Concerning theſe ſects, the reader will find ſomething fuller in IRENÆUS, and the other ancient writers; and a yet more learned and ſatisfactory account in GRABE's *Spicilegium Patr. et Hæreticor.* § 2. p. 69. 82. There is an ample account of the *Marcoſians* in IRENÆUS, *Contr. Hær.* lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 70.

[(*y*) Here Dr. MOSHEIM has fallen into a ſlight inaccuracy in confounding the opinions of theſe two heretics; ſince it is certain, that BLASTUS was for reſtoring the Jewiſh religion, and celebrated the paſſover on the fourteenth day; whereas FLORINUS was a Valentinian, and maintained the doctrine of the *two principles*, with other Gnoſtic errors.]

God, the *rulers of the ſeven planets* that preſided over this world, the *tyranny of demiurge*, and alſo concerning CHRIST united to the man JESUS, in order to deſtroy the empire of this uſurper. But, beſides theſe, they maintained the following particular tenet, from whence alſo they received the name of Ophites, *viz.* "That the *ſerpent*, by which our firſt parents were deceived, was "either CHRIST himſelf, or *ſophia*, concealed under the form of that animal;" and in conſequence of this opinion, they are ſaid to have nouriſhed a certain number of ſerpents, which they looked upon as ſacred, and to which they offered a ſort of worſhip, a ſubordinate kind of divine honours. It was no difficult matter for thoſe, who made a diſtinction between the ſupreme being and the creator of the world, and who looked upon every thing as divine, which was in oppoſition to *demiurge*, to fall into theſe extravagant notions.

Monarchians and Patropaſſians.

XX. The ſchiſms and commotions that aroſe in the church, from a mixture of the Oriental and Egyptian philoſophy with the Chriſtian religion, were, in the ſecond century, increaſed by thoſe Grecian philoſophers who embraced the doctrine of CHRIST. The Chriſtian doctrine, concerning the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, and the *two natures* united in our Bleſſed Saviour, were, by no means, reconcileable with the tenets of the ſages and doctors of *Greece*, who therefore endeavoured to explain them in ſuch a manner as to render them comprehenſible. PRAXEAS, a man of genius and learning, began to propagate theſe explications at *Rome*, and was ſeverely perſecuted for the errors they contained. He denied any *real* diſtinction between the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, and maintained that the *Father*, ſole creator of all things, had united to himſelf the *human nature* of CHRIST. Hence his followers were called Monarchians, becauſe of their denying a plurality of perſons in the deity; and alſo Patropaſſians, becauſe, according to TERTULLIAN's account, they believed that the FATHER was ſo intimately united with the man CHRIST, his ſon, that he ſuffered with him the anguiſh of an afflicted life, and the torments of an ignominious death. However ready many may have been to embrace this erroneous doctrine, it does not however appear, that this ſect formed to themſelves a ſeparate place of worſhip, or removed themſelves from the ordinary aſſemblies of Chriſtians [z].

Theodotus, Artemon.

XXI. An opinion highly reſembling that now mentioned was, about the ſame time, profeſſed at *Rome* by THEODOTUS, who, though a tanner, was a man of profound learning, and alſo by ARTEMAS, or ARTEMON, from whom the ſect of the Artemonites derived their origin. The accounts given of theſe two perſons, by the ancient writers, are not only few in number, but are alſo extremely ambiguous and obſcure. Their ſentiments, however, as far as they can be collected from the beſt records, amount to this; "That at the "birth of the man CHRIST, a certain *divine energy*, or portion of the divine "nature (and not the *perſon* of the father as PRAXEAS imagined) united "itſelf to him."

It is impoſſible to decide with any degree of certainty, which of the two was the moſt ancient; THEODOTUS, or ARTEMON; as alſo whether they both taught the ſame doctrine, or differed in their opinions. One thing, indeed, is certain, and that is, that the diſciples of both applied the dictates of philoſophy, and even the ſcience of geometry, to the explication of the Chriſtian doctrine.

---

[z] TERTULLIANI *Lib. contra Praxeam*; as alſo PETRI WESSELINGII *Probabilia*, cap. xxvi. p. 223.

Hermogenes.

XXII. A like attachment to the dictates of a preſumptuous philoſophy, induced HERMOGENES, a painter by profeſſion, to abandon the doctrine of Chriſtianity concerning the origin of the world, and the nature of the ſoul, and thus to raiſe new troubles in the church. Regarding *matter* as the fountain of all evil, he could not perſuade himſelf that God had created it from nothing, by an almighty act of his will; and therefore he maintained, that the world, with whatever it contains, as alſo the ſouls of men, and other ſpirits, were formed by the deity from an uncreated and eternal maſs of corrupt *matter*. In this doctrine there were many intricate things, and it manifeſtly jarred with the opinions commonly received among Chriſtians relative to that difficult and almoſt unſearchable ſubject. How HERMOGENES explained thoſe doctrines of Chriſtianity, which oppoſed his ſyſtem, neither TERTULLIAN, who refuted it, nor any of the ancient writers inform us [a].

The illiterate ſects.

XXIII. Theſe ſects, which we have now been paſſing in review, may be juſtly regarded as the offspring of philoſophy. But they were ſucceeded by one in which ignorance reigned, and which was the mortal enemy of philoſophy and letters. It was formed by MONTANUS, an obſcure man, without any capacity or ſtrength of judgment, and who lived in a Phrygian village, called *Pepuza*. This weak man was fooliſh and extravagant enough to take it into his head, that he was the *paraclete*, or comforter [b], which the divine

Montanus.

---

[a] There is yet extant a book written by TERTULLIAN againſt HERMOGENES, in which the opinions of the latter, concerning *Matter and the origin of the world*, are warmly oppoſed. We have loſt another work of the ſame author, in which he refuted the notion of HERMOGENES concerning *the Soul*.

[b] Thoſe are undoubtedly miſtaken, who have aſſerted that MONTANUS gave himſelf out for the *Holy Ghoſt*. However weak he may have been in point of capacity, he was not fool enough to puſh his pretenſions ſo far. Neither have they, who inform us that MONTANUS pretended to have received from above the ſame *ſpirit*, or *paraclete*, which formerly animated the apoſtles, interpreted with accuracy the meaning of this heretic. It is, therefore, neceſſary to obſerve here, that MONTANUS made a diſtinction between the *paraclete*, promiſed by CHRIST to his apoſtles, and the *Holy Spirit*, that was ſhed upon them on the day of pentecoſt, and underſtood, by the former, a divine teacher pointed out by CHRIST under the name of *paraclete*, or comforter, who was to perfect the goſpel by the addition of ſome doctrines omitted by our Saviour, and to caſt a full light upon others which were expreſſed in an obſcure and imperfect manner, though for wiſe reaſons which ſubſiſted during the miniſtry of CHRIST, and, indeed, MONTANUS was not the only perſon that made this diſtinction. Other Chriſtian doctors were of opinion, that the *paraclete*, promiſed by JESUS to his diſciples, was a divine ambaſſador, entirely diſtinct from the Holy Ghoſt, which was ſhed upon the apoſtles. In the third century, MANES interpreted the promiſe of CHRIST in this manner. He pretended moreover, that he himſelf was the *paraclete*; and that, in his perſon, the prediction was fulfilled. Every one knows, that MAHOMET entertained the ſame notion, and applied to himſelf the prediction of CHRIST, concerning the coming of the *paraclete*. It was, therefore, this divine meſſenger that MONTANUS pretended to be, and not the Holy Ghoſt. This will appear, with the utmoſt evidence, to thoſe who read with attention the account given of this matter by TERTULLIAN, who was the moſt famous of all the diſciples of MONTANUS, and the moſt perfectly acquainted with every point of his doctrine.

Saviour, at his departure from the earth, promiſed to ſend to his diſciples to lead them to all truth. He made no attempts upon the peculiar doctrines of Chriſtianity, but only declared, that he was ſent with a divine commiſſion to give, to the moral precepts delivered by CHRIST and his apoſtles, the finiſhing *touch* that was to bring them to perfection. He was of opinion, that CHRIST and his apoſtles made, in their precepts, many allowances to the infirmities of thoſe among whom they lived, and that this condeſcending indulgence rendered their ſyſtem of moral laws imperfect and incomplete. He therefore added to the laws of the goſpel many auſtere deciſions; inculcated the neceſſity of multiplying faſts; prohibited ſecond marriages as unlawful; maintained that the church ſhould refuſe abſolution to thoſe who had fallen into the commiſſion of enormous ſins; and condemned all care of the body, eſpecially all nicety in dreſs, and all female ornaments. The exceſſive auſterity of this ignorant fanatic did not ſtop here; he ſhewed the ſame averſion to the nobleſt employments of the mind, that he did to the innocent enjoyments of life; and gave it as his opinion, that philoſophy, arts, and whatever ſavoured of polite literature ſhould be mercileſly baniſhed from the Chriſtian church. He looked upon thoſe Chriſtians as guilty of a moſt heinous tranſgreſſion, who ſaved their lives, by flight, from the perſecuting ſword, or who ranſomed them, by money, from the hands of their cruel and mercenary judges. I might mention many other precepts of the ſame teacher, equal to theſe in ſeverity and rigour.

The ſucceſs of Montanus, and his doctrine.

XXIV. It was impoſſible to ſuffer, within the bounds of the church, an enthuſiaſt, who gave himſelf out for a teacher, whoſe precepts were ſuperior in ſanctity to thoſe of CHRIST himſelf, and who impoſed his auſtere diſcipline upon Chriſtians, as enjoined, by a divine authority, and dictated by the oracle of celeſtial wiſdom, which ſpoke to the world through him. Beſides, his diſmal predictions concerning the diſaſters that were to happen in the empire, and the approaching deſtruction of the Roman republic were every way proper to render him obnoxious to the governing powers, and alſo to excite their reſentment againſt the church, which nouriſhed ſuch an inauſpicious prophet in its boſom. MONTANUS therefore, firſt by a decree of certain aſſemblies, and afterwards by the unanimous voice of the whole church, was ſolemnly ſeparated from the body of the faithful. It is, however, certain, that the very ſeverity of his doctrines gained him the eſteem and confidence of many, who were far from being of the loweſt order. The moſt eminent among theſe were PRISCILLA and MAXIMILLA, ladies more remarkable for their opulence, than for their virtue, and who fell with a high degree of warmth and zeal into the viſions of their fanatical chief; propheſied like him, and imitated the pretended *paraclete* in all the variety of his extravagance and folly. Hence it became an eaſy matter for MONTANUS to erect a new church, which was alſo, in effect, firſt eſtabliſhed at *Pepuza*, a town in *Phrygia*, and afterwards ſpred abroad through *Aſia*, *Afric*, and a part of *Europe*. The moſt eminent and learned of all the followers of this rigid enthuſiaſt was TERTULLIAN, a man of great learning and genius, but of an auſtere and melancholy natural temper. This great man, by adopting the ſentiments of MONTANUS, and maintaining his cauſe with fortitude and even vehemence, in a multitude of books written upon that occaſion, has ſhown to the world a mortifying ſpectacle of the deviations of which human nature is capable, even in thoſe, in whom it ſeems to have approached the neareſt to perfection [c].

---

[c] For an account of the Montaniſts, ſee EUSEB. *Eccl. Hiſtory,* book v. ch. xvi. and in general all the writers ancient and modern (eſpecially TERTULLIAN) who have profeſſedly written concerning the ſects of the early ages. The learned Mr. THEOPHILUS WERNSDORF publiſhed at *Dantzick* in the year 1751, a moſt ingenious expoſition of whatever regards the ſect of the Montaniſts, under the following title, *Commentatio de Montaniſtis Sæculi ſecundi, vulgo creditis Hæreticis.*

THE

THIRD CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Which contains the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

The rights and immunities of the Chriſtians encreaſed.

I. THAT the Chriſtians ſuffered, in this century, calamities and injuries of the moſt dreadful kind, is a matter that admits of no debate; nor was there, indeed, any period in which they were not expoſed to perpetual dangers. For not to mention the fury of the people ſet in motion, ſo often, by the craft and zeal of their licentious prieſts, the evil came from a higher ſource; the prætors and magiſtrates, notwithſtanding the ancient laws of the emperors in favour of the Chriſtians, had it in their power to purſue them with all ſorts of vexations, as often as avarice, cruelty, or ſuperſtition rouſed up the infernal ſpirit of perſecution in their breaſts. At the ſame time it is certain, that the rights and privileges of the Chriſtians were multiplied, in this century, much more than many are apt to imagine. In the army, at the court, and, indeed, in all the orders of the nation, there was a conſiderable number of Chriſtians, who lived entirely unmoleſted; and what is ſtill more, the profeſſion of Chriſtianity was no obſtacle to public preferment under moſt of the emperors that reigned in this century. It is alſo certain, that the Chriſtians had, in many places, houſes where they aſſembled for the purpoſes of divine worſhip, and that, with the knowledge and connivance of the emperors and magiſtrates. And though it be more than probable, that this liberty was, upon many occaſions, and even for the moſt part, purchaſed at a high rate; yet it is manifeſt, that ſome of the emperors were very favourably inclined towards the Chriſtians, and were far from having an averſion to their religion.

Under various emperors.

II. Caracalla, the ſon of Severus, was proclaimed emperor in the year 2011, and, during the ſix years of his government, he neither oppreſſed the Chriſtians himſelf, nor permitted any others to treat them with cruelty or injuſtice. Heliogabalus alſo, though in other reſpects the moſt infamous of

The benignity of Alexander towards the Chriſtians.

of all princes [*a*], and, perhaps, the moſt odious of all mortals, ſhewed no marks of bitterneſs or averſion to the diſciples of Jesus. His ſucceſſor, Alexander Severus, who was a prince diſtinguiſhed by a noble aſſemblage of the moſt excellent and illuſtrious virtues, did not, indeed, abrogate the laws that had been enacted againſt the Chriſtians; and this is the reaſon why we have ſome examples of martyrdom under his adminiſtration. It is nevertheleſs certain, that he ſhewed, in many ways, and upon every occaſion that was offered him, the moſt undoubted marks of benignity and favour; nay, he is ſaid to have gone ſo far as to pay a certain ſort of worſhip to the divine author of our religion [*b*]. This his favourable inclination towards the Chriſtians was probably owing, at firſt, to the inſtructions and counſels of his mother Julia Mammæa, for whom he had a high degree of love and veneration. Julia had very favourable ſentiments of the Chriſtian religion; and, being once at *Antioch*, ſent for the famous Origen from *Alexandria*, in order to enjoy the pleaſure and advantage of his converſation and inſtructions. Thoſe who aſſert that Julia, and her ſon Alexander, embraced the Chriſtian religion, are, by no means, furniſhed with unexceptionable teſtimonies to confirm this fact; though we may affirm, with confidence, that this virtuous prince looked upon Chriſtianity as meriting, beyond all other religions, toleration and favour from the ſtate, and conſidered its author as worthy of a place among thoſe who have been diſtinguiſhed by their ſublime virtues, and honoured with a commiſſion from above [*c*].

Other emperors favourable to the Chriſtians.

III. Under Gordian the Chriſtians lived in tranquillity. His ſucceſſors the Philips, father and ſon, proved ſo favourable and even friendly to them, that theſe two emperors paſſed, in the opinion of many, for Chriſtians; and, indeed, the arguments alleged to prove that they embraced, though in a ſecret and clandeſtine manner, the religion of Jesus, ſeem to have a high degree of weight, and render this fact extremely probable. But as theſe arguments are oppoſed by others equally ſpecious, that famous queſtion, relating to the religion of Philip the Arabian, and his ſon, muſt be left undecided [*d*]. Neither ſide offers reaſons ſo victorious and unanſwerable, as to produce a full and complete conviction; and this is therefore one of thoſe many caſes, where a ſuſpenſion of judgment is both allowable and wiſe. With reſpect to Gal-

Queſtion concerning the religion of the emperor Philip.

[*a*] Lampridius *Vita Elagabali*, c. iii. p. 796.

[*b*] Lamprid. *De Vita Severi*, cap. xxix. p. 930. Vide Carol. Henr. Zeibichii, *Diſſ. de Chriſto ab Alexandro in larario cultu*, quæ extat in *Miſcellan. Lipſ. nov.* tom. iii. p. 42.

[*c*] Vide Frid. Spanhemii, *Diſſ. de Lucii, Britonum Regis, Juliæ Mammææ, et Philipporum converſionibus*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 400. Item, Paul. Jablonski, *Diſſ. de Alexandro Severo ſacris Chriſtianis per Gnoſticos initiato*, in *Miſcellan. Lipſ. novis*, tom. iv. p. 56.

[(*d*) The authors of the univerſal hiſtory have determined the queſtion which Dr. Mosheim leaves here undecided, and they think it may be affirmed, that Philip and his ſon embraced the goſpel, ſince that opinion is built upon ſuch reſpectable authority as that of Jerom, Chrysostom, Dionysius of Alexandria, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Cedrenus, Ruffinus, Syncellus, Orosius, Jornandes, Ammianus Marcellinus, the learned cardinal Bona, Vincentius Lirinensis, Huetius, and others. Dr. Mosheim refers his readers, for an account of this matter, to the following writers: Spanheim. *De Chriſtianiſmo Philipp.* tom. ii. Opp. p. 400. Entretiens *Hiſtoriques ſur le Chriſtianiſme de l'Empereur Philippe, par P. De* L. F. Mammachii *Origines et Antiqu. Chriſtianæ*, tom. ii. p. 252. Confer Fabric. *De luce Evang.* &c. p. 252.]

LIENUS, and ſome other emperors of this century, if they did not profeſſedly favour the progreſs of Chriſtianity, yet neither did they oppreſs its followers, nor retard its advancement.

The number of Chriſtians encreaſed.

IV. This clemency and benevolence, which the followers of JESUS experienced from great men, and, eſpecially, from thoſe of imperial dignity, muſt be placed, without doubt, among thoſe human means, that contributed to multiply the number of Chriſtians, and to enlarge the bounds of the church. Other cauſes, however, both *divine* and *human*, muſt be added here to render a complete and ſatisfactory account of this matter. Among the cauſes which belong to the firſt of theſe claſſes, we do not only reckon the intrinſic force of celeſtial truth, and the piety and fortitude of thoſe who declared it to the world, but alſo that *eſpecial* and *interpoſing providence*, which, by dreams and viſions, preſented to the minds of many, who were either inattentive to the Chriſtian doctrine, or its profeſſed enemies, touched their hearts with a conviction of the truth, and a ſenſe of its importance, and engaged them, without delay, to profeſs themſelves the diſciples of CHRIST[e]. To this may alſo be added, the healing of diſeaſes, and other miracles, which many Chriſtians were yet enabled to perform by invoking the name of the divine Saviour[f]. The number of miracles was, however, much leſs in this than in the preceding century; nor muſt this alteration be attributed only to the divine wiſdom, which rendered miraculous interpoſitions leſs frequent in proportion as they became leſs neceſſary, but alſo to his juſtice, which was provoked to diminiſh the frequency of gifts, which ſome did not ſcruple to pervert to mercenary purpoſes[g].

The cauſes thereof partly divine.

Partly human.

V. If we turn our view to the human means that contributed, at this time, to multiply the numbers of Chriſtians, and to extend the limits of the church, we ſhall find a great variety of cauſes uniting theirin fluence, and contributing jointly to this happy purpoſe. Among theſe muſt be reckoned the tranſlations of the ſacred writings into various languages, the zeal and labours of ORIGEN in ſpreading abroad copies of them every where, and the different works that were publiſhed, by learned and pious men, in defence of the goſpel. We may add alſo to this, that the acts of beneficence and liberality, performed by the Chriſtians, even towards thoſe whoſe religious principles they abhorred, had a great influence in attracting the eſteem and removing the prejudices of many, who were thus prepared for examining, with candor, the Chriſtian doctrine, and, conſequently, for receiving its divine light. The worſhipers of the Pagan deities muſt have been deſtitute of every generous affection, of every humane feeling, if the view of that boundleſs charity, which the Chriſtians exerciſed towards the poor, the love they expreſſed even to their enemies, the tender care they took of the ſick and infirm, the humanity they diſcovered in the redemption of captives, and the other illuſtrious virtues, which rendered them ſo worthy of univerſal eſteem, had not touched their hearts, diſpelled their prepoſſeſſions, and rendered them more favourable to the diſciples of Jesus. If, among the cauſes of the propagation of Chriſtianity, there is any place due to *pious frauds*, it is certain that they merit a very ſmall part of the honour of having contributed to this glorious purpoſe; ſince they were practiſed by few, and that very ſeldom.

---

[e] See, for an account of this matter, the following authors: ORIGEN. lib. i. *adv. Celſum*, p. 35. *Homil. in Lucæ* vii. p. 216. tom. ii. Opp. edit. Baſil; as alſo TERTULLIAN. *De anima*, cap. xiv. p. 348. edit. Rigaltii, and EUSEBIUS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. v. p. 208.

[f] ORIGEN. *contr. Celſum*, lib. i. p. 5. 7. EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v. cap. vii. CYPRIANUS *Ep.* i. *ad Donat.* p. 3. and the notes of BALUZIUS upon that paſſage, p. 376.

[g] SPENCER not. in *Origen. contra Celſum*, p. 6, 7.

Several countries receive the light of the goſpel.

VI. That the limits of the church were extended in this century is a matter beyond all controverſy. It is not, however, equally certain in what manner, by what perſons, or in what parts of the world this was effected. Origen, invited from *Alexandria* by an Arabian prince, converted, by his aſſiduous labours, a certain tribe of wandering Arabs to the Chriſtian faith [*h*]. The Goths, a fierce and warlike people, who inhabited the countries of *Myſia* and *Thrace*, and who, accuſtomed to rapine, vexed the neighbouring provinces by their perpetual incurſions, received the knowledge of the goſpel by the means of certain Chriſtian doctors ſent thither from *Aſia*. The holy lives of theſe venerable teachers, and the miraculous powers with which they were endowed, attracted the eſteem even of a people educated to nothing but plunder and devaſtation, and abſolutely uncivilized by letters or ſcience; and their authority and influence grew ſo great, and produced, in proceſs of time, ſuch remarkable effects, that a great part of this barbarous people became the diſciples of Christ, and put off, in a manner, that ferocity that was become ſo natural to them [*i*].

Among others Gaul and Germany.

VII. The Chriſtian aſſemblies, founded in Gaul by the Aſiatic doctors in the preceding century, were few in number, and of very little extent; but both their number and their extent were conſiderably encreaſed from the time of the emperor Decius. Under his reign Dionysius, Gatian, Trophimus, Paul, Saturninus, Martial, Stremonius, men of exemplary piety, paſſed into this province, and, amidſt dangers and trials of various kinds, erected churches at *Paris*, *Tours*, *Arles*, and ſeveral other places. This was followed by a rapid progreſs of the goſpel among the Gauls, as the diſciples of theſe pious teachers ſpred, in a ſhort time, the knowledge of Chriſtianity through the whole country [*k*]. We muſt alſo place in this century the origin of ſeveral German churches, ſuch as thoſe of *Cologn*, *Treves*, *Metz*, and others, of which Eucharius, Valerius, Maternus, and Clemens were the principal founders [*l*]. The hiſtorians of *Scotland* inform us, that the light of Chriſtianity aroſe upon that country during this century; but, though there be nothing improbable in this aſſertion, yet it is not built upon inconteſtable authority [*m*].

---

[h] Eusebius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xix. p. 221.

[i] Sozomenus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. vi. Paulus Diaconus, *Hiſt. Miſcell.* lib. ii. cap. xiv. Philostorgius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. v. p. 470.

[k] See the hiſtory of the *Francs* by Gregory de Tours, book i. ch. xxviii. p. 23. Theodor. Ruinart. *Acta Martyr. ſincera*, p. 109.

[l] See Aug. Calmet, *Hiſt. de Lorraine*, tom. i. diſſert. i. p. 7. Jo. Nicol. ab. Hontheim, *Hiſtoriæ Trevirenſis*, tom. i. ubi *Diſſ. de æra fundati Epiſcopatus Trevirenſis.*

[m] See Usher et Stillingfleet *Antiquit. et Origin. Eccleſiar. Brit.* See alſo George Mackenzie, *De Regali Scotorum proſapia*, cap. viii. p. 119.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The perſecution under Severus.

I. In the beginning of this century, the Chriſtian church ſuffered calamities of various kinds throughout the provinces of the Roman empire. Theſe ſufferings increaſed in a terrible manner, in conſequence of a law made, in the year 203, by the emperor Severus (who, in other reſpects, was certainly no enemy to the Chriſtians) by which every ſubject of the empire was prohibited to change the religion of his anceſtors for that of the Chriſtian or Jewiſh [n]. This law was, in its effects, moſt prejudicial to the Chriſtians; for, though it did not formally condemn them, and ſeemed only adapted to put a ſtop to the further progreſs of the goſpel, yet it induced rapacious and unjuſt magiſtrates to perſecute even unto death the poorer ſort among the Chriſtians, that thus the richer might be led, through fear of like treatment, to purchaſe their tranquillity and ſafety at an expenſive rate. Hence many of the diſciples of Chriſt, both in *Egypt*, and alſo in ſeveral parts of *Aſia* and *Africa*, were put to death in conſequence of this law. Among theſe Leonidas the father of Origen, Perpetua and Felicitas (thoſe two famous African ladies, whoſe *acts* [o] are come down to our times) Potamiena Marcella, and other martyrs of both ſexes, acquired an illuſtrious name by the magnanimity and tranquillity with which they endured the moſt cruel ſufferings.

That under Maximin.

II. From the death of Severus to the reign of Maximin, the condition of the Chriſtians was, in ſome places, proſperous, and, in all, ſupportable. But with Maximin the face of affairs changed. This unworthy emperor, having animated the Roman ſoldiers to aſſaſſinate Alexander Severus, dreaded the reſentment of the Chriſtians, whom that excellent prince had favoured and protected in a diſtinguiſhed manner; and, for this reaſon, he ordered the biſhops whom he knew, that Alexander had always treated as his intimate friends, to be ſeized and put to death [p]. During his reign, the Chriſtians ſuffered in the moſt barbarous manner; for, though the edict of this tyrant extended only to the biſhops and leaders of the Chriſtian church, yet its ſhocking effects reached much further; as it animated the heathen prieſts, the magiſtrates, and the multitude againſt Chriſtians of every rank and order [q].

Many Chriſtians, in conſequence of the cruelty of Decius, become chargeable with defection.

III. This ſtorm was ſucceeded by a calm, in which the Chriſtians enjoyed an happy tranquillity for many years. The acceſſion of Decius Trajan to the imperial throne, in the year 249, raiſed a new tempeſt, in which the fury of perſecution fell in a dreadful manner upon the church of Chriſt.

---

[n] Eusebius, *Eccleſ. Hiſtor.* lib. vi. cap. i. Spartianus *in Severo*, cap. xvi, xvii. p. 617.

[o] Theod. Ruinart, *Acta Martyr*, p. 90.

[p] Euseb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xxviii. p. 225. Orosius, *Hiſt.* lib. vii. cap. xix. p. 509.

[q] Origen. tom. xxviii. in Matth. Opp. tom. i. p. 137. See alſo Firmilianus in Cypriani *Epiſtolis*, p. 140.

For this emperor, either from an ill-grounded fear of the Chriſtians, or from a violent zeal for the ſuperſtition of his anceſtors, publiſhed moſt terrible and cruel edicts, by which the prætors were ordered, upon pain of death, either to extirpate the whole body of Chriſtians without exception, or to force them, by torments of various kinds, to return to the Pagan worſhip. Hence, in all the provinces of the empire, multitudes of Chriſtians were, during the ſpace of two years, put to death by the moſt horrid puniſhments [r], which an ingenious barbarity could invent. The moſt unhappy circumſtance of all theſe cruelties was, their fatal influence upon the faith and conſtancy of many of the ſufferers; for as this perſecution was much more terrible than all thoſe that preceded it, ſo a great number of Chriſtians diſmayed, not at the approach of death, but at the aſpect of thoſe dreadful and lingering torments, which a barbarous magiſtracy had prepared to combat their conſtancy, fell from the profeſſion of their faith, and ſecured themſelves from puniſhment, either by *offering ſacrifices*, or by *burning incenſe* before the images of the gods, or by purchaſing *certificates* from the Pagan prieſts. Hence aroſe the opprobrious names of SACRIFICATI, given to thoſe who *ſacrificed*; THURIFICATI, to thoſe who *burned incenſe*; and LIBELLATICI, to thoſe who *produced certificates* [s].

Warm conteſts occaſioned by the defection of Chriſtians.

IV. This defection of ſuch a prodigious number of Chriſtians under DECIUS was the occaſion of great commotions in the church, and produced debates of a very difficult and delicate nature. For the *lapſed*, or thoſe that had fallen from their Chriſtian profeſſion, were deſirous to be reſtored to church-communion, without ſubmitting to that painful courſe of *penitential* diſcipline, which the eccleſiaſtical laws indiſpenſably required. The biſhops were divided upon this matter: ſome were for ſhewing the deſired indulgence, while others oppoſed it with all their might [t]. In *Egypt* and *Africa*, many, in order to obtain more ſpeedily the pardon of their apoſtaſy, intereſted the *martyrs* in their behalf, and received from them *letters of reconciliation and peace**, i. e. a formal act, by which they (the martyrs) declared, in their laſt moments, that they looked upon them as worthy of their communion, and deſired of conſequence that they ſhould be reſtored to their place among the brethren. Some biſhops and preſbyters re-admitted into the church with too much facility, apoſtates and tranſgreſſors, who produced ſuch teſtimonies as

* Libellos Pacis.

---

[r] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xxxix. p. 234. cap. xli. p. 238. GREGORIUS NYSS. *in vita Thaumaturgi*, tom. iii. Opp. p. 568. CYPRIANUS, *De Lapſis*, p. 182.

[(s) Theſe *certificates* were not all equally criminal, nor ſuppoſed all a degree of apoſtaſy equally enormous. It is therefore neceſſary to advertiſe the reader of the following diſtinctions omitted by Dr. MOSHEIM: Theſe certificates were ſometimes no more than a permiſſion to abſtain from ſacrificing, obtained by a fee given to the judges, and were not looked upon as an act of apoſtaſy, unleſs the Chriſtians, who demanded them, had declared to the judges, that they had conformed themſelves to the emperor's edicts. But, at other times, they contained a profeſſion of paganiſm, and were either offered voluntarily by the apoſtate, or were ſubſcribed by him, when they were preſented to him by the perſecuting magiſtrate. Many uſed certificates, as letters of ſecurity, obtained from the prieſts at a high rate, and which diſpenſed them from either profeſſing or denying their ſentiments. See SPANHEIM. *Hiſtoria Chriſtiana*, p. 732, 733. See alſo PRUD. MARANUS *in vita Cypriani*, operibus ejus præmiſſa, § 6. p. 54.]

[t] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xliv. CYPR. *Epiſtolæ*, in many places.

theſe.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. III.

The perſecution under Severus.

I. IN the beginning of this century, the Chriſtian church ſuffered calamities of various kinds throughout the provinces of the Roman empire. Theſe ſufferings increaſed in a terrible manner, in conſequence of a law made, in the year 203, by the emperor SEVERUS (who, in other reſpects, was certainly no enemy to the Chriſtians) by which every ſubject of the empire was prohibited to change the religion of his anceſtors for that of the Chriſtian or Jewiſh [*n*]. This law was, in its effects, moſt prejudicial to the Chriſtians; for, though it did not formally condemn them, and ſeemed only adapted to put a ſtop to the further progreſs of the goſpel, yet it induced rapacious and unjuſt magiſtrates to perſecute even unto death the poorer ſort among the Chriſtians, that thus the richer might be led, through fear of like treatment, to purchaſe their tranquillity and ſafety at an expenſive rate. Hence many of the diſciples of CHRIST, both in *Egypt*, and alſo in ſeveral parts of *Aſia* and *Africa*, were put to death in conſequence of this law. Among theſe LEONIDAS the father of ORIGEN, PERPETUA and FELICITAS (thoſe two famous African ladies, whoſe *acts* [*o*] are come down to our times) POTAMIENA MARCELLA, and other martyrs of both ſexes, acquired an illuſtrious name by the magnanimity and tranquillity with which they endured the moſt cruel ſufferings.

That under Maximin.

II. From the death of SEVERUS to the reign of MAXIMIN, the condition of the Chriſtians was, in ſome places, proſperous, and, in all, ſupportable. But with MAXIMIN the face of affairs changed. This unworthy emperor, having animated the Roman ſoldiers to aſſaſſinate ALEXANDER SEVERUS, dreaded the reſentment of the Chriſtians, whom that excellent prince had favoured and protected in a diſtinguiſhed manner; and, for this reaſon, he ordered the biſhops whom he knew, that ALEXANDER had always treated as his intimate friends, to be ſeized and put to death [*p*]. During his reign, the Chriſtians ſuffered in the moſt barbarous manner; for, though the edict of this tyrant extended only to the biſhops and leaders of the Chriſtian church, yet its ſhocking effects reached much further; as it animated the heathen prieſts, the magiſtrates, and the multitude againſt Chriſtians of every rank and order [*q*].

Many Chriſtians, in conſequence of the cruelty of Decius, become chargeable with defection.

III. This ſtorm was ſucceeded by a calm, in which the Chriſtians enjoyed an happy tranquillity for many years. The acceſſion of DECIUS TRAJAN to the imperial throne, in the year 249, raiſed a new tempeſt, in which the fury of perſecution fell in a dreadful manner upon the church of CHRIST.

[*n*] EUSEBIUS, *Eccleſ. Hiſtor.* lib. vi. cap. i. SPARTIANUS *in Severo,* cap. xvi, xvii. p 617.

[*o*] THEOD. RUINART, *Acta Martyr*, p. 90.

[*p*] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xxviii. p. 225. OROSIUS, *Hiſt.* lib. vii. cap. xix. p. 509.

[*q*] ORIGEN. tom. xxviii. in Matth. Opp. tom. i. p. 137. See alſo FIRMILIANUS in CYPRIANI *Epiſtolis*, p. 140.

For this emperor, either from an ill-grounded fear of the Chriſtians, or from a violent zeal for the ſuperſtition of his anceſtors, publiſhed moſt terrible and cruel edicts, by which the prætors were ordered, upon pain of death, either to extirpate the whole body of Chriſtians without exception, or to force them, by torments of various kinds, to return to the Pagan worſhip. Hence, in all the provinces of the empire, multitudes of Chriſtians were, during the ſpace of two years, put to death by the moſt horrid puniſhments [r], which an ingenious barbarity could invent. The moſt unhappy circumſtance of all theſe cruelties was, their fatal influence upon the faith and conſtancy of many of the ſufferers; for as this perſecution was much more terrible than all thoſe that preceded it, ſo a great number of Chriſtians diſmayed, not at the approach of death, but at the aſpect of thoſe dreadful and lingering torments, which a barbarous magiſtracy had prepared to combat their conſtancy, fell from the profeſſion of their faith, and ſecured themſelves from puniſhment, either by *offering ſacrifices*, or by *burning incenſe* before the images of the gods, or by purchaſing *certificates* from the Pagan prieſts. Hence aroſe the opprobrious names of SACRIFICATI, given to thoſe who *ſacrificed*; THURIFICATI, to thoſe who *burned incenſe*; and LIBELLATICI, to thoſe who *produced certificates* [s].

Warm conteſts occaſioned by the defection of Chriſtians.

IV. This defection of ſuch a prodigious number of Chriſtians under DECIUS was the occaſion of great commotions in the church, and produced debates of a very difficult and delicate nature. For the *lapſed*, or thoſe that had fallen from their Chriſtian profeſſion, were deſirous to be reſtored to church-communion, without ſubmitting to that painful courſe of *penitential* diſcipline, which the eccleſiaſtical laws indiſpenſably required. The biſhops were divided upon this matter: ſome were for ſhewing the deſired indulgence, while others oppoſed it with all their might [t]. In *Egypt* and *Africa*, many, in order to obtain more ſpeedily the pardon of their apoſtaſy, intereſted the *martyrs* in their behalf, and received from them *letters of reconciliation and peace* *, i. e. a formal act, by which they (the martyrs) declared, in their laſt moments, that they looked upon them as worthy of their communion, and deſired of conſequence that they ſhould be reſtored to their place among the brethren. Some biſhops and preſbyters re-admitted into the church with too much facility, apoſtates and tranſgreſſors, who produced ſuch teſtimonies as

* Libellos Pacis.

---

[r] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xxxix. p. 234. cap. xli. p. 238. GREGORIUS NYSS. *in vita Thaumaturgi*, tom. iii. Opp. p. 568. CYPRIANUS, *De Lapſis*, p. 182.

[(s) Theſe *certificates* were not all equally criminal, nor ſuppoſed all a degree of apoſtaſy equally enormous. It is therefore neceſſary to advertiſe the reader of the following diſtinctions omitted by Dr. MOSHEIM: Theſe certificates were ſometimes no more than a permiſſion to abſtain from ſacrificing, obtained by a fee given to the judges, and were not looked upon as an act of apoſtaſy, unleſs the Chriſtians, who demanded them, had declared to the judges, that they had conformed themſelves to the emperor's edicts. But, at other times, they contained a profeſſion of paganiſm, and were either offered voluntarily by the apoſtate, or were ſubſcribed by him, when they were preſented to him by the perſecuting magiſtrate. Many uſed certificates, as letters of ſecurity, obtained from the prieſts at a high rate, and which diſpenſed them from either profeſſing or denying their ſentiments. See SPANHEIM. *Hiſtoria Chriſtiana*, p. 732, 733. See alſo PRUD. MARANUS *in vita Cypriani*, operibus ejus præmiſſa, § 6. p. 54.]

[t] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xliv. CYPR. *Epiſtolæ*, in many places.

theſe. But CYPRIAN, biſhop of *Carthage*, a man of ſevere wiſdom, and great dignity of character, acted in quite another way. Though he had no intention to derogate from the authority of the venerable martyrs, yet he oppoſed with vigour this unreaſonable lenity, and ſet limits to the efficacy of theſe letters of reconciliation and peace. Hence aroſe a keen diſpute between him and the martyrs, confeſſors, preſbyters, and lapſed, ſeconded by the people; and yet, notwithſtanding this formidable multitude of adverſaries, the venerable biſhop came off victorious [u].

The perſecutions under Gallus and Voluſianus.

V. GALLUS, the ſucceſſor of DECIUS, and VOLUSIANUS, ſon of the former, re-animated the flame of perſecution, which was beginning to burn with leſs fury [w]. And, beſides the ſufferings which the Chriſtians had to undergo in conſequence of their cruel edicts, they were alſo involved in the public calamities that prevailed at this time, and ſuffered grievouſly from a terrible peſtilence which ſpred deſolation through many provinces of the empire [x]. This peſtilence alſo was an occaſion which the Pagan prieſts uſed with dexterity to renew the rage of perſecution againſt them, by perſuading the people that it was on account of the lenity uſed toward the Chriſtians, that the gods ſent down their judgments upon the nations. In the year 254, VALERIAN, being declared emperor, made the fury of perſecution ceaſe, and reſtored the church to a ſtate of tranquillity.

Under Valerian.

VI. The clemency and benevolence which VALERIAN ſhewed to the Chriſtians, continued until the fifth year of his reign. Then the ſcene began to change, and the change indeed was ſudden. MACRIANUS, a ſuperſtitious and cruel bigot to paganiſm, had gained an entire aſcendant over VALERIAN, and was his chief counſellor in every thing that related to the adminiſtration of the government. By the perſuaſion of this imperious miniſter, the Chriſtians were prohibited to aſſemble themſelves together, and their biſhops and doctors were ſent into baniſhment. This edict was publiſhed in the year 257, and was followed, the year after, by one ſtill more ſevere; in conſequence of which a conſiderable number of Chriſtians, in all the different provinces of the empire, were put to death, and that by ſuch cruel methods of execution, as were much more terrible than death itſelf. Of thoſe that ſuffered in this perſecution, the moſt eminent were CYPRIAN, biſhop of *Carthage*; SIXTUS, biſhop of *Rome*; and LAURENTIUS, a Roman deacon, who was barbarouſly conſumed by a ſlow and lingring fire. An unexpected event ſuſpended, for a while, the ſufferings of the Chriſtians. VALERIAN, was made priſoner in the war againſt the Perſians; and his ſon GALLIENUS, in the year 260, reſtored peace to the church [y].

The ſtate of the church under Gallienus, Claudius, and Aurelian.

VII. The condition of the Chriſtians was rather ſupportable, than happy under the reign of GALLIENUS, which laſted eight years; as alſo under the

[u] The whole hiſtory of this controverſy may be gathered from the epiſtles of CYPRIAN. See alſo GABR. ALBASPINÆUS, *Obſervat. Eccleſ.* lib. i. obſerv. xx. p. 94. DALLÆUS, *De pœnis et ſatisfactionibus humanis*, lib. vii. cap. xvi. p. 706.

[w] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. i. p. 250. CYPRIAN. *Epiſt.* lvii, lviii.

[x]. Vid. CYPRIANI *Lib. ad Demetrianum.*

[y] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. x, xi. p. 255. *Acta Cypriani*, as they are to be found

ſhort adminiſtration of his ſucceſſor CLAUDIUS. Nor did they ſuffer much during the firſt four years of the reign of AURELIAN, who was raiſed to the empire in the year 270. But the fifth year of this emperor's adminiſtration would have proved fatal to them, had not his violent death prevented the execution of his cruel purpoſes. For while, ſet on by the unjuſt ſuggeſtions of his own ſuperſtition, or by the barbarous counſels of a bigotted prieſthood, he was preparing a formidable attack upon the Chriſtians, he was obliged to march into Gaul, where he was murdered in the year 275, before his edicts were publiſhed throughout the empire [z]. Few therefore ſuffered martyrdom under his reign; and, indeed, during the remainder of this century, the Chriſtians enjoyed a conſiderable meaſure of eaſe and tranquillity. They were, at leaſt, free from any violent attacks of oppreſſion and injuſtice, except in a ſmall number of caſes, where the avarice and ſuperſtition of the Roman magiſtrates interrupted their tranquillity [a].

The attempts of the philoſophers againſt Chriſtianity.

VIII. While the Roman emperors and proconſuls employed againſt the Chriſtians the terror of unrighteous edicts, and the edge of the deſtroying ſword, the Platonic philoſophers, who have been deſcribed above, exhauſted againſt Chriſtianity all the force of their learning and eloquence, and all the reſources of their art and dexterity, in rhetorical declamations, ſubtle writings, and ingenious ſtratagems. Theſe artful adverſaries were ſo much the more dangerous and formidable, as they had adopted ſeveral of the doctrines and inſtitutions of the goſpel, and, with a ſpecious air of moderation and impartiality, were attempting, after the example of their maſter AMMONIUS, to reconcile paganiſm with Chriſtianity, and to form a ſort of coalition of the ancient and the new religion. Theſe philoſophers had, at their head, in this century, PORPHYRY, a *Syrian*, or, as ſome allege, a *Tyrian* by birth, who wrote againſt the Chriſtians a long and laborious work, which was deſtroyed afterwards by an imperial edict [b]. He was, undoubtedly, a writer of great dexterity, genius, and erudition, as thoſe of his works, that yet remain, ſufficiently teſtify. But thoſe very works, and the hiſtory of his life, ſhew us, at the ſame time, that he was a much more virulent, than a formidable enemy to the Chriſtians. For by them it appears, that he was much more attentive to the ſuggeſtions of a ſuperſtitious ſpirit, and the viſions of a lively fancy, than to the ſober dictates of right reaſon and a ſound judgment. And it may be more eſpecially obſerved of the fragments that yet remain of his work againſt the Chriſtians, that they are equally deſtitute of judgment and equity, and are utterly unworthy of a wiſe and a good man [c].

---

in the *Acta Martyrum* RUINARTI, p. 216. CYPRIANI *Epiſt.* lxxvii. p. 158. edit. Baluz. lxxxii. p. 165.

[z] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxx. LACTANTIUS, *De mortibus Perſequutor.* cap. vi.

[a] Among theſe vexations may be reckoned the cruelty of GALERIUS MAXIMIAN, who, towards the concluſion of this century, perſecuted the miniſters of his court, and the ſoldiers of his army, who had profeſſed Chriſtianity. See EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. i. p. 292. iv. p. 295. 317.

[b] See HOLSTENIUS, *De vita Porphyr.* cap. xi. FABRIC. *Lux Evang.* p. 154. BUDDEUS, *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1009.

[c] This work of PORPHYRY againſt the Chriſtians was burnt by an edict of CONSTANTINE

Compariſons drawn between the philoſophers and Chriſt.

IX. Many were the deceitful and perfidious ſtratagems by which this ſect endeavoured to obſcure the luſtre and to diminiſh the authority of the Chriſtian doctrine. But none of theſe were more dangerous than the ſeducing artifice, with which they formed a compariſon between the life, actions, and miracles of CHRIST, and the hiſtory of the ancient philoſophers; and placed the contending parties in ſuch fallacious points of view, as to make the pretended ſages of antiquity appear, in nothing, inferior to the divine Saviour. With this view ARCHYTAS of *Tarentum*, PYTHAGORAS, of whom PORPHYRY wrote the life, APOLLONIUS *Tyanæus*, a Pythagorean philoſopher, whoſe miracles and peregrinations were highly celebrated by the vulgar, were brought upon the ſcene, and exhibited as divine teachers and rivals of the glory of the ſon of God. PHILOSTRATUS, one of the moſt eminent rhetoricians of this age, compoſed a pompous hiſtory of the life of APOLLONIUS, who was little elſe than a cunning knave, and did nothing but ape the auſterity and ſanctity of PYTHAGORAS. This hiſtory appears manifeſtly deſigned to draw a parallel between CHRIST and the philoſopher of *Tyana*; but the impudent fictions, and the ridiculous fables with which this work is filled, muſt, one would think, have rendered it incapable of deceiving any who were poſſeſſed of a ſound mind; any, but ſuch, as, through the corruption of vicious prejudices, were willing to be deceived [d].

The pernicious conſequences of this compariſon.

X. But as there are no opinions however abſurd, and no ſtories however idle and improbable, that a weak and ignorant multitude, who are more attentive to the pomp of *words*, than to the truth of *things*, will not eaſily ſwallow; ſo it happened, that many were enſnared by the abſurd attempts of theſe inſidious philoſophers. Some were induced by theſe perfidious ſtratagems to abandon the Chriſtian religion, which they had embraced. Others, when they heard that true Chriſtianity (as it was taught by JESUS, and not as it was afterwards corrupted by his diſciples) differed almoſt, in nothing, from the Pagan religion properly explained and reſtored to its primitive purity, determined to remain in the religion of their anceſtors, and in the worſhip of their gods. A third ſort, were led by theſe compariſons between CHRIST and the ancient philoſophers, to form to themſelves a motley ſyſtem of religion compoſed of the tenets of both parties, whom they treated with the ſame veneration and reſpect. Such was, particularly, the method of ALEXANDER SEVERUS, who paid indiſcriminately divine honours to CHRIST,

---

the GREAT. It was divided into fifteen books, as we find in EUSEBIUS, and contained the blackeſt calumnies againſt the Chriſtians. The *firſt* book treated of the contradictions, which he pretended to have found in the ſacred writings.—The greateſt part of the *twelfth* is employed in fixing the time when the prophecies of DANIEL were written. For PORPHYRY himſelf found theſe prophecies ſo clearly and evidently fulfilled, that, to avoid the force of the argument, deducible from thence, in favour of Chriſtianity, he was forced to have recourſe to this abſurd ſuppoſition, that *theſe prophecies had been publiſhed under the name of* DANIEL, by one who lived in the time of ANTIOCHUS, and wrote after the arrival of the events foretold. METHODIUS, EUSEBIUS, and APOLLINARIS wrote againſt PORPHYRY. But theſe refutations have been long ſince loſt.]

[d] See OLEARIUS's preface to the life of APOLLONIUS, by PHILOSTRATUS; as alſo MOSHEIM's notes to his Latin tranſlation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem*, p. 304. 309. 311. 834.

and to ORPHEUS, to APOLLONIUS, and the other philoſophers and heroes whoſe names were famous in ancient times.

The attempts of the Jews againſt the Chriſtians.

XI. The credit and power of the Jews were too much abaſed to render them as capable of injuring the Chriſtians, by their influence upon the magiſtrates, as they had formerly been. This did not, however, diſcourage their malicious efforts, as the books which TERTULLIAN and CYPRIAN have written againſt them abundantly ſhew, with ſeveral other writings of the Chriſtian doctors, who complained of the malignity of the Jews, and of their perfidious ſtratagems [*e*]. During the perſecution under SEVERUS, a certain perſon called DOMNINUS, who had embraced Chriſtianity, deſerted to the Jews, doubtleſs, to avoid the puniſhments that were decreed againſt the Chriſtians; and it was to recall this apoſtate to his duty, and his profeſſion, that SERAPION, biſhop of *Antioch*, wrote a particular treatiſe againſt the Jews [*f*]. We may, however, conclude from this inſtance, that when the Chriſtians were perſecuted, the Jews were treated with leſs ſeverity and contempt, on account of their enmity againſt the diſciples of JESUS. And from the ſame fact we may alſo learn, that, though they were in a ſtate of great ſubjection and abaſements, yet they were not entirely deprived of all power of oppreſſing the Chriſtians.

[*e*] HIPPOLYTUS, *Serm. in Suſann. et Daniel,* tom. i. Opp. p. 274. 276.

[*f*] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 213.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

CENT. III.

The decay of learning.

I. THE arts and ſciences, which, in the preceding century, were in a declining ſtate, ſeemed, in this, ready to expire, and had now loſt all their vigour and all their luſtre. The celebrated rhetorician **LONGINUS**, and the eminent hiſtorian **DION CASSIUS**, with a few others, were the laſt among the Greeks, who ſtood in the breach againſt the prevailing ignorance, and barbariſm of the times. Men of learning and genius were leſs numerous ſtill in the weſtern provinces of the empire, though there were, in ſeveral places, flouriſhing ſchools erected for the advancement of the ſciences, and the culture of taſte and genius. Different reaſons contributed to this decay of learning. Few of the emperors patronized the ſciences, or encouraged, by the proſpect of their favour and protection, that emulation, which is the ſoul of the republic of letters. Beſides, the civil wars that almoſt always diſtracted the empire, were extremely unfavourable to the purſuit of ſcience, and the perpetual incurſions of the barbarous nations interrupted that leiſure and tranquillity which are ſo eſſential to the progreſs of learning and knowledge, and extinguiſhed, among a people accuſtomed to nothing almoſt but the din of arms, all deſire of literary acquiſitions [g].

The ſtate of philoſophy, principally the Platonic.

II. If we turn our eyes towards the ſtate of philoſophy, the proſpect will appear ſomewhat leſs deſolate and comfortleſs. There were as yet, in ſeveral of the Grecian ſects, men of conſiderable knowledge and reputation, of whom **LONGINUS** has mentioned the greateſt part [h]. But all theſe ſects were gradually eclipſed by the ſchool of **AMMONIUS**, whoſe origin and doctrines have been conſidered above. This victorious ſect, which was formed in *Egypt*, iſſued forth from thence with ſuch a rapid progreſs, that in a ſhort time it extended itſelf almoſt throughout the Roman empire, and drew into its *vortex*, the greateſt part of thoſe, who applied themſelves, through inclination, to the ſtudy of philoſophy. This amazing progreſs was due to

Plotinus.

PLOTINUS, the moſt eminent diſciple of **AMMONIUS**, a man of a moſt ſubtle invention, and endowed by nature with a genius capable of the moſt profound reſearches, and equal to the inveſtigation of the moſt abſtruſe and difficult ſubjects. This penetrating and ſublime philoſopher taught publicly firſt in *Perſia*, and afterwards at *Rome*, and in *Campania*; in all which places the youth flocked in crouds to receive his inſtruction. He comprehended the

[g] See the *Literary Hiſtory of France*, by the Benedictine monks, vol. i. par. II. p. 317.

[h] In his life of **PLOTINUS**, epitomized by **PORPHYRY**, ch. xx. p. 128. edit. Fabricii.

precepts of his philoſophy in ſeveral books, the moſt of which are yet extant [*i*].

His doctrine univerſally propagated.

III. The number of diſciples that were formed in the ſchool of Plotinus, is almoſt beyond credibility. The moſt famous of them was Porphyry [*k*], who ſpred abroad through *Sicily*, and many other countries, the doctrine of his maſter, reviſed with great accuracy, adorned with the graces of a flowing and elegant ſtyle, and enriched with new inventions and curious improvements [*l*]. From the time of Ammonius, until the ſixth century, this was almoſt the only ſyſtem of philoſophy that was publicly taught at *Alexandria*. A certain philoſopher, whoſe name was Plutarch, having learned it there, brought it into *Greece*, and renewed, at *Athens*, the celebrated *academy*, from whence iſſued a ſet of illuſtrious philoſophers, whom we ſhall have occaſion to mention in the progreſs of this work [*m*].

Different ſects of this philoſophy.

IV. We have unfolded above the nature and doctrines of this philoſophy, as far as was compatible with the brevity of our preſent deſign. It is, however, proper to add here, that its votaries were not all of the ſame ſentiments, but thought very differently upon a variety of ſubjects. This difference of opinion was the natural conſequence of that fundamental law, which the whole ſect was obliged to keep conſtantly in view, *viz. That truth was to be purſued with the utmoſt liberty, and to be collected from all the different ſyſtems in which it lay diſperſed.* Hence it happened, that the Athenians rejected certain opinions that were entertained by the philoſophers of *Alexandria*. None however, who were ambitious to be ranked among theſe new Platoniſts, called in queſtion the main doctrines, which formed the ground work of their ſingular ſyſtem; thoſe, for example, which regarded the *exiſtence of one God*; the *fountain of all things*; the *eternity of the world*; the *dependance of matter upon the ſupreme being*; the *nature of ſouls*; the *plurality of gods*; the *method of interpreting the popular ſuperſtitions*, &c.

The ſtate of learning among the Chriſtians.

V. The famous queſtion concerning the excellence and utility of human learning was now debated with great warmth among the Chriſtians, and the contending parties, in this controverſy, ſeemed hitherto of equal force in point of numbers, or nearly ſo. Many recommended the ſtudy of philoſophy, and an acquaintance with the Greek and Roman literature; while others maintained, that theſe were pernicious to the intereſts of genuine Chriſtianity and the progreſs of true piety. The cauſe of letters and philoſophy triumphed, however, by degrees; and thoſe, who wiſhed well to them, gained ground more and more, till, at length, the ſuperiority was manifeſtly decided in their favour. This victory was principally due to the influence and authority of

---

[*i*] See Porphyrii *vita Plotini*; of which Fabricius has given an edition in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iv p. 91. Bayle's *Diction.* tom. iii. at the article Plotinus; as alſo Brucker's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*.

[(*k*) Porphyry was firſt the diſciple of Longinus, author of the juſtly celebrated *Treatiſe on the ſublime*. But having paſſed from *Greece* to *Rome*, where he heard Plotinus, he was ſo charmed with the genius and penetration of this philoſopher, that he attached himſelf entirely to him. See Plotin. *vit.* p 3. Eunap c. ii. p. 17.]

[*l*] Holstenius *vit. Porphyrii*, republiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius.

[*m*] Marini *vita Procli*, cap. xi, xii. p. 25.

ORIGEN who having been early inſtructed in the new kind of Platoniſm already mentioned, blended it unhappily with the purer and more ſublime tenets of a celeſtial doctrine, and recommended it, in the warmeſt manner, to the youth who attended his public leſſons. The fame of this philoſopher increaſed daily among the Chriſtians, and, in proportion to his riſing credit, his method of propoſing and explaining the doctrines of Chriſtianity gained authority, till it became almoſt univerſal. Beſides, ſome of the diſciples of **PLOTINUS** having embraced Chriſtianity, on condition that they ſhould be allowed to retain ſuch of the opinions of their maſter, as they thought of ſuperior excellence and merit [n], this muſt alſo have contributed, in ſome meaſure, to turn the balance in favour of the ſciences. Theſe Chriſtian philoſophers preſerving ſtill a fervent zeal for the doctrines of their heathen chief, would naturally embrace every opportunity of ſpreding them abroad, and inſtilling them into the minds of the ignorant and the unwary.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

Of the form of church-government.

I. THE form of eccleſiaſtical government that had been adopted by Chriſtians in general, had now acquired greater degrees of ſtability and force, both in particular churches, and in the univerſal ſociety of Chriſtians collectively conſidered. It appears inconteſtable from the moſt authentic records, and the beſt hiſtories of this century, that, in the larger cities, there was, at the head of each church, a perſon to whom was given the title of *biſhop*, who ruled this ſacred community with a certain ſort of authority, in counſel, however, with the body of *preſbyters*, and conſulting, in matters of moment, the opinion and the voices of the whole aſſembly [o]. It is alſo equally evident, that in every province, *one* biſhop was inveſted with a certain ſuperiority over the reſt, in point of rank and authority. This was neceſſary to the maintenance of that *aſſociation* of churches that had been introduced in the preceding century, and contributed, moreover, to facilitate the holding of *general councils*, and to give a certain degree of order and conſiſtence to their proceedings. It muſt, at the ſame time, be carefully obſerved, that the rights and privileges of theſe *primitive biſhops* were not, every where, accurately fixed, nor determined in ſuch a manner as to prevent encroachments and diſputes; nor does it appear, that the chief authority, in the province, was always conferred upon that biſhop who preſided over the church eſtabliſhed in the metropolis. It is further to be noticed, as a matter beyond all diſpute, that the biſhops of *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, conſidered as rulers of primitive and apoſtolic churches, had a kind of pre-eminence over all others, and were not only conſulted frequently in affairs of a difficult and momentous nature, but were alſo diſtinguiſhed by peculiar rights and privileges.

---

[n] AUGUSTINUS, *Epiſtola* lvi. *ad Dioſcor.* p. 260. tom. ii. Opp.

[o] A ſatisfactory account of this matter may be ſeen in BLONDELLI *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi de Epiſcopis et Preſbyteris*, p. 136. as that author has collected all the teſtimonies of the ancients relative to that ſubject.

The power and dignity of the biſhop of *Rome* in this century; what?

II. With reſpect, particularly, to the biſhop of *Rome*; he is ſuppoſed by CYPRIAN to have had, at this time, a certain pre-eminence in the church [p]; nor does he ſtand alone in this opinion. But it is to be carefully obſerved, that thoſe who, with CYPRIAN, attributed this pre-eminence to the Roman prelate, inſiſted, at the ſame time, with the utmoſt warmth upon the *equality* in point of *dignity* and *authority*, that ſubſiſted among all the members of the epiſcopal order. In conſequence of this opinion of an *equality* among all Chriſtian biſhops, they rejected, with contempt, the judgment of the *biſhop of Rome*, when they thought it ill-founded or unjuſt, and followed their own ſenſe of things with a perfect independence. Of this CYPRIAN himſelf gave an eminent example in his famous controverſy with STEPHEN biſhop of *Rome*, concerning the *baptiſm of heretics*, in which he treated the arrogance of that imperious prelate with a noble indignation, and alſo with a perfect contempt. Whoever, therefore, compares all theſe things together, will eaſily perceive, that the *pre-eminence* of the biſhop of *Rome*, was a pre-eminence of *order* and *aſſociation* [q], and not of *power* and *authority*. Or, to explain the matter yet more clearly, the pre-eminence of the biſhop of *Rome*, in the univerſal church, was ſuch as that of CYPRIAN, biſhop of *Carthage*, was in the African churches. And every one knows that the precedence of this latter prelate diminiſhed, in nothing, the equality that ſubſiſted among all the African biſhops, invalidated, in no inſtance, their rights and liberties, but gave only to CYPRIAN, as the preſident of their general aſſemblies, a power of calling councils, of preſiding in them, of admoniſhing his brethren in a mild and fraternal manner, and of executing, in ſhort, ſuch offices as the *order* and purpoſes of theſe eccleſiaſtical meetings neceſſarily required [r].

The government of the church degenerates into a monarchical form.

III. The face of things began now to change in the Chriſtian church. The ancient method of eccleſiaſtical government ſeemed, in general, ſtill to ſubſiſt, while, at the ſame time, by imperceptible ſteps, it varied from the primitive rule, and degenerated towards the form of a religious monarchy. For the biſhops aſpired to higher degrees of power and authority, than they had formerly poſſeſſed; and not only violated the rights of the people, but alſo made gradual encroachments upon the privileges of the preſbyters. And that they might cover theſe uſurpations with an air of juſtice, and an appearance of reaſon, they publiſhed new doctrines concerning the nature of the church and of the epiſcopal dignity, which however were, in general, ſo obſcure, that they themſelves ſeem to have underſtood them as little as thoſe to whom they were delivered. One of the principal authors of this change, in the government of the church, was CYPRIAN, who pleaded for the power of the biſhops with more zeal and vehemence, than had ever been hitherto employed in that cauſe, though not with an unſhaken conſtancy and perſeverance; for, in difficult and perilous times, neceſſity might oblige him to yield, and ſubmit all things to the judgment and authority of the church.

---

[p] CYPRIAN. *Ep.* lxxiii. p. 131. *Ep.* lv. p. 86. Ib. *De Unitate Eccleſiæ*, p. 195. edit. Baluzii.

[(q) So I have tranſlated *Principatus ordinis et conſociationis*, which could not be otherwiſe rendered without a long circumlocution. The *pre-eminence* here mentioned ſignifies the right of *convening councils*, *of preſiding in them*, *of collecting voices*, and ſuch other things as were eſſential to the *order* of theſe aſſemblies.]

[r] See STEPH. BALUZII *ad not. ad Cypriani Epiſtolas*, p. 387. 389. 400. conſult particularly the LXXI. LXXIII epiſtles of CYPRIAN, and the LV, addreſſed to CORNELIUS biſhop of *Rome*, in which letters the Carthaginian prelate pleads with warmth and vehemence for the equality of all Chriſtian biſhops.

The vices of the clergy.

IV. This change, in the form of eccleſiaſtical government, was ſoon followed by a train of vices which diſhonoured the character and authority of thoſe, to whom the adminiſtration of the church was committed. For, though ſeveral yet continued to exhibit to the world illuſtrious examples of primitive piety and Chriſtian virtue; yet many were ſunk in luxury and voluptuouſneſs, puffed up with vanity, arrogance, and ambition, poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of contention and diſcord, and addicted to many other vices, that caſt an undeſerved reproach upon the holy religion, of which they were the unworthy profeſſors and miniſters. This is teſtified in ſuch an ample manner, by the repeated complaints of many of the moſt reſpectable writers of this age [*s*], that truth will not permit us to ſpred the veil, which we ſhould otherwiſe be deſirous to caſt over ſuch enormities among an order ſo ſacred. The *biſhops* aſſumed, in many places, a princely authority, particularly thoſe who had the greateſt number of churches under their inſpection, and who preſided over the moſt opulent aſſemblies. They appropriated to their evangelical function the ſplendid enſigns of temporal majeſty. A throne, ſurrounded with miniſters, exalted above his equals the ſervant of the meek and humble JESUS, and ſumptuous garments dazzled the eyes and the minds of the multitude into an ignorant veneration for their arrogated authority. The example of the biſhops was ambitiouſly imitated by the *preſbyters*, who, neglecting the ſacred duties of their ſtation, abandoned themſelves to the indolence and delicacy of an effeminate and luxurious life. The *deacons*, beholding the preſbyters deſerting thus their functions, boldly uſurped their rights and privileges, and the effects of a corrupt ambition were ſpred through every rank of the ſacred order.

Hence the leſſer orders.

V. From what has been now obſerved, we may come, perhaps, at the true origin of *minor*, or leſſer *orders*, which were, in this century, added, every where, to thoſe of the *biſhops*, *preſbyters*, and *deacons*. For, certainly, the titles and offices of *ſubdeacons*, *acolythi*, *oſtiarii*, or door-keepers, *readers*, *exorciſts*, and *copiatæ*, would never have been heard of in the church, if its rulers had been aſſiduouſly and zealouſly employed in promoting the intereſts of the truth and piety by their labours and their example. But when the honours and privileges of the biſhops and preſbyters were augmented, the *deacons* alſo began to extend their ambitious views, and to deſpiſe thoſe lower functions and employments, which they had hitherto exerciſed with ſuch humility and zeal. The additional orders that were now created to diminiſh the labours of the preſent rulers of the church, had functions allotted to them, which their names partly explain [*t*]. The inſtitution of *exorciſts* was a conſequence of the doctrine of the New Platoniſts, which the Chriſtians adopted, and which taught, that the evil *genii*, or ſpirits, were continually hovering over human bodies, towards which they were carried by a natural and vehement deſire; and that vitious men were not ſo much impelled to ſin by an innate depravity, or by the ſeduction of example, as by the internal ſuggeſtions of ſome evil dæmon. The *copiatæ* were employed in providing for the decent interment of the dead.

[*s*] ORIGEN. *Comm. in Matthæum*, par. i. Opp. p. 420, 441, 442. EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. i. p. 291, &c.

Marriage of the clergy.

Concubines introduced among the clergy.

VI. Marriage was permitted to all the various ranks and orders of the clergy, high and low. Thoſe, however, who continued in a ſtate of celebacy, obtained by this abſtinence a higher reputation of ſanctity and virtue than others. This was owing to an almoſt general perſuaſion, that they, who took wives, were of all others the moſt ſubject to the influence of malignant demons [*u*]. And as it was of infinite importance to the intereſts of the church, that no impure or malevolent ſpirit entered into the bodies of ſuch as were appointed to govern, or to inſtruct others; ſo the people were deſirous that the clergy ſhould uſe their utmoſt efforts to abſtain from the pleaſures of the conjugal life. Many of the ſacred order, eſpecially in *Africa*, conſented to ſatisfy the deſires of the people, and endeavoured to do this, in ſuch a manner, as not to offer an entire violence to their own inclinations. For this purpoſe, they formed connexions with thoſe women, who had made vows of perpetual chaſtity, and it was an ordinary thing for an eccleſiaſtic to admit one of theſe fair ſaints to the participation of his bed, but ſtill under the moſt ſolemn declarations, that nothing paſſed in this commerce, that was contrary to the

---

[(*t*) The *ſubdeacons* were deſigned to eaſe the *deacons* of the meaneſt part of their work. Their office, conſequently, was to prepare the ſacred veſſels of the altar, and to deliver them to the deacons in time of divine ſervice, to attend the doors of the church during the communion-ſervice, to go on the biſhops embaſſies, with his letters or meſſages to foreign churches. In a word, they were ſo ſubordinate to the ſuperior rulers of the church, that, by a canon of the council of *Laodicea*, they were forbidden to ſit in the preſence of a *deacon* without his leave.—The order of *acolythi* was peculiar to the Latin church; for there was no ſuch order in the Greek church during the four firſt centuries. Their name ſignifies *attendants*, and their principal office was to light the candles of the church, and to attend the miniſters with wine for the euchariſt.—The *oſtiarii*, or *door-keepers*, were appointed to open and ſhut the doors, as officers and ſervants under the *deacons* and *ſubdeacons*; to give notice of the times of prayer and church-aſſemblies, which, in time of perſecution, required a private ſignal for fear of diſcovery; and that probably was the firſt reaſon for inſtituting this order in the church of *Rome*, whoſe example, by degrees, was ſoon followed by other churches.—The *readers* were thoſe that were appointed to read the ſcripture in that part of divine ſervice to which the *catechumens* were admitted.—The *exorciſts* were appointed to drive out evil ſpirits from the bodies of perſons poſſeſſed; they had been long known in the church, but were not erected into an eccleſiaſtical order until the latter end of the third century.—The *copiatæ*, or *foſſarii*, were an order of the inferior clergy, whoſe buſineſs it was to take care of funerals, and to provide for the decent interment of the dead. In vain have Baronius and other Romiſh writers aſſerted, that theſe inferior orders were of apoſtolical inſtitution. The contrary is evidently proved, ſince none of theſe offices are mentioned as having taken place before the third century, and the origin of ſome of them can be traced no higher than the fourth.]

[*u*] Porphyrius, περὶ ἀποχῆς, lib. iv. p. 417.

rules of chaſtity and virtue [*w*]. Theſe holy concubines were called, by the Greeks, Συνεισάκτοι, and by the Latins, *Mulieres ſubintroductæ.* This indecent cuſtom alarmed the zeal of the more pious among the biſhops, who employed the utmoſt efforts of their ſeverity and vigilance to aboliſh it, though it was a long time before they entirely effected this laudable purpoſe.

The principal Greek and Oriental writers.

VII. Thus we have given a ſhort, though not a very pleaſing, view of the rulers of the church during this century, and ſhould now mention the principal writers that diſtinguiſhed themſelves in it by their learned and pious productions. The moſt eminent of theſe, whether we conſider the extent of his fame, or the multiplicity of his labours, was ORIGEN, a *preſbyter* and *catechiſt* of *Alexandria*, a man of vaſt and uncommon abilities, and the greateſt luminary of the Chriſtian world that this age exhibited to view. Had the juſtneſs of his judgment been equal to the immenſity of his genius, the fervor of his piety, his indefatigable patience, his extenſive erudition, and his other eminent and ſuperior talents, all encomiums muſt have fallen ſhort of his merit. Yet ſuch as he was, his virtues and his labours deſerve the admiration of all ages, and his name will be tranſmitted with honour through the annals of time as long as learning and genius ſhall be eſteemed among men [*x*].

The ſecond in renown among the writers of this century was JULIUS AFRICANUS, a native of *Paleſtine*, a man of the moſt profound erudition, but the greateſt part of whoſe learned labours are unhappily loſt.

HIPPOLYTUS, whoſe hiſtory is much involved in darkneſs [*y*], is alſo eſteemed among the moſt celebrated authors and martyrs of this age; but thoſe writings, which at preſent bear his name, are juſtly looked upon by many, as either extremely corrupted or entirely ſpurious.

GREGORY, biſhop of *New Cæſarea*, acquired, at this time, the title of *Thaumaturgus*, i. e. wonder-worker, on account of the variety of great and ſignal miracles, which he is ſaid to have wrought during the courſe of his miniſtry. Few of his works have come down to our times, and his miracles are called in queſtion by many, as unſupported by ſufficient evidence [*z*].

It were to be wiſhed that we had more of the writings of DIONYSIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, than thoſe which have ſurvived the ruins of time, ſince the few remaining fragments of his works diſcover the moſt conſummate wiſdom and prudence, and the moſt amiable ſpirit of moderation and candor, and thus abundantly vindicate from all ſuſpicion of flattery the ancients who mentioned him under the title of DIONYSIUS the GREAT [*a*].

---

[w] *Credat Judæus Apella.* See however DODWELL. *Diſſ. tertia Cyprianica,* and LUD. AN. MURATORIUS, *Diſſ. de Syniſactis et Agapetis,* in his *Anecdot. Græc.* p. 218; as alſo BALUZIUS *ad Cypriani Epiſtol.* p. 5. 12, &c.

[x] See a very learned and uſeful work of the famous HUET biſhop of *Avranches*, intitled, *Origeniana.* See alſo DOUCIN, *Hiſtoire d'Origene et des mouvemens arrivés dans l'Egliſe au ſujet de ſa doctrine*; and BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ORIGEN.

[y] The Benedictine monks have, with great labour and erudition, endeavoured to diſpel this darkneſs in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i. p. 361.

[z] See VAN DALE's preface to his Latin treatiſe concerning *Oracles*, p. 6.

[a] The hiſtory of DIONYSIUS is particularly illuſtrated by JAC. BASNAGE, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livre ii. cap. v. p. 68.

METHODIUS appears to have been a man of great piety, and highly reſpectable on account of his eminent virtue; but thoſe of his works, which are yet extant, diſcover no great degree of penetration and acuteneſs in handling controverſy and weighing opinions.

The Latin writers.

VIII. **CYPRIAN**, biſhop of *Carthage*, a man of the moſt eminent abilities and flowing eloquence ſtands foremoſt in the liſt of Latin writers. His letters, and indeed the moſt of his works, breath ſuch a noble and pathetic ſpirit of piety, that it is impoſſible to read them without the tendereſt feelings of a ſublime enthuſiaſm. We muſt however obſerve, that he would have been a better writer, had he been leſs attentive to the ornaments of rhetoric; and a better biſhop, had he been able to reſtrain the vehemence of his temper, and to diſtinguiſh, with more acuteneſs, between truth and falſhood.

The *dialogue* of **MINUCIUS FELIX**, which bears the title of *Octavius*, effaces with ſuch judgment, ſpirit, and force the calumnies and reproaches that were caſt upon the Chriſtians by their adverſaries, that it deſerves an attentive peruſal from thoſe who are deſirous to know the ſtate of the church during this century.

The VII *Books* of **ARNOBIUS**, the African, written *againſt the Gentiles*, are a ſtill more copious and ample defence of the Chriſtians, and, though obſcure in ſeveral places, may yet be red with pleaſure and with profit. It is true, that this rhetorician, too little inſtructed in the Chriſtian religion when he wrote this work, has mingled great errors with ſolemn and important truths, and has exhibited Chriſtianity under a certain philoſophical form, very different from that in which it is commonly received.

We refer our readers, for an account of the authors of inferior note, who lived in this century, to thoſe who have profeſſedly given hiſtories or enumerations of the Chriſtian writers.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The ſtate of the Chriſtian doctrine.

I. THE principal doctrines of Chriſtianity were now explained to the people in their native purity and ſimplicity, without any mixture of abſtract reaſonings or ſubtile inventions; nor were the feeble minds of the multitude loaded with a great variety of precepts [*b*]. But the Chriſtian doctors, who had applied themſelves to the ſtudy of letters and philoſoply, ſoon abandoned the frequented paths, and ſtruck out into the devious wilds of fancy. The Egyptians diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this new method of explaining the truth. They looked upon it as a noble and a glorious taſk to bring the doctrines of celeſtial wiſdom into a certain ſubjection to the precepts of their philoſophy; and to make deep and profound reſearches into the intimate and hidden nature of thoſe truths which the divine Saviour had delivered to his diſciples. ORIGEN was at the head of this ſpeculative tribe. This great man, enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philoſophy, ſet it up as the teſt of all religion, and imagined that the reaſons of each doctrine were to be found in that favourite philoſophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it [*c*]. It muſt be confeſſed, that he handled this matter with modeſty and with caution; but he ſtill gave an example to his diſciples, the abuſe of which could not fail to be pernicious, and under the authority of which they would naturally indulge themſelves without reſtraint in every wanton fancy. And ſo, indeed, the caſe was: for the diſciples of ORIGEN, breaking forth from the limits fixed by their maſter, interpreted in the moſt licentious manner the divine truths of religion according to the tenor of the Platonic philoſophy. From theſe teachers the philoſophical or *ſcholaſtic theology*, as it is called, derived its origin, and proceeding hence, paſſed through various forms and modifications according to the genius, turn, and erudition of thoſe who embraced it.

[*b*] See ORIGEN. *in Præf. libror. de Principiis*, tom. i. Opp. p. 49. and lib. i. *De Principiis*, cap. ii. See alſo GREGORII NEOCÆSARIENSIS *Expoſitio Fidei*, p. 11. of his works according to the edition of GER. VOSSIUS.

The riſe of the myſtic theology.

II. The ſame principles gave riſe to another ſpecies of *theology*, which was called *myſtic*. And what muſt ſeem at firſt ſight ſurprizing here is, that this *myſtic theology*, though formed at the ſame time, and derived from the ſame ſource with the *ſcholaſtic*, yet had a natural tendency to overturn and deſtroy it. The authors of this *myſtic* ſcience are not known, but the principles from whence it ſprung are manifeſt. Its firſt promoters proceeded from that known doctrine of the Platonic ſchool, which alſo was adopted by ORIGEN and his diſciples, that *the divine nature was diffuſed through all human ſouls*, or in other words, that *the faculty of reaſon*, from which proceeds the health and vigour of the mind, was an *emanation from God, into the human ſoul, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine*. They denied that men could, by labour or ſtudy, excite this celeſtial flame in their breaſts, and therefore they diſapproved highly of the attempts of thoſe, who, by definitions, abſtract theorems, and profound ſpeculations, endeavoured to form diſtinct notions of truth, and to diſcover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained that *ſilence*, *tranquillity*, *repoſe*, and *ſolitude*, accompanied with ſuch acts of mortification as might tend to extenuate and exhauſt the body, were the *means* by which the *hidden* and *internal word* was *excited* to produce its latent virtues, and to inſtruct men in the knowledge of divine things. For thus they reaſoned: "They who behold with a noble contempt all human "affairs, who turn away their eyes from terreſtrial vanities, and ſhut all the "avenues of the outward ſenſes againſt the contagious influences of a "material world, muſt neceſſarily return to God, when the ſpirit is thus diſengaged from the impediments that prevented that happy union. And in "this bleſſed frame, they not only enjoy inexpreſſible raptures from their "communion with the ſupreme being, but alſo are inveſted with the ineſtimable privilege of contemplating truth undiſguiſed and uncorrupted in "its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and deluſive form."

[*c*] This is manifeſt from what remains of his *Stromata*; as alſo from his books *de Principiis*, which are ſtill preſerved in a Latin tranſlation of them by RUFFINUS.

Hence the riſe of monks and hermits.

III. This method of reaſoning produced ſtrange effects, and drove many into caves and deſarts, where they macerated their bodies with hunger and thirſt, and ſubmitted to all the miſeries of the ſevereſt diſcipline that a gloomy imagination could preſcribe. And it is not improbable that PAUL, the firſt hermit, was rather engaged by this fanatical ſyſtem than by the perſecution under DECIUS, to fly into the moſt ſolitary deſarts of *Thebais*, where he led, during the ſpace of ninety years, a life more worthy of a ſavage animal, than of a rational being [*d*]. It is, however, to be obſerved, that though PAUL is placed at the head of the order of *hermits*, yet that unſociable manner of life was very common in *Egypt*, *Syria*, *India*, and *Meſopotamia*, not only long before his time, but even before the coming of CHRIST. And it is ſtill practiſed among the Mahometans, as well as the Chriſtians, in thoſe arid and burning climates [*e*]. For the glowing atmoſphere, that ſurrounds theſe countries, is a natural cauſe of that love of ſolitude and repoſe, of that indolent and melancholy diſpoſition, that are remarkably common among their languid inhabitants.

The zeal of many in ſpreading abroad the ſacred writings.

IV. But let us turn away our eyes from theſe ſcenes of fanaticiſm, which are ſo opprobrious to human nature, and conſider ſome other circumſtances, that belong more or leſs to the hiſtory of the Chriſtian doctrine during this century. And here it is proper to mention the uſeful labours of thoſe, who manifeſted their zeal for the holy ſcriptures by the care they took to have accurate copies of them multiplied every where, and that, at ſuch moderate prices, as rendered them of eaſy purchaſe; as alſo to have them tranſlated into various languages, and publiſhed in correct editions. Many of the more opulent among the Chriſtians contributed generouſly a great part of their ſubſtance to the carrying on theſe pious and excellent undertakings. PIERIUS and HESYCHIUS in *Egypt*, and LUCIAN at *Antioch*, employed much pains in correcting the copies of the *Septuagint*; and PAMPHILIUS of *Cæſarea*, laboured with great diligence and ſucceſs in works of the ſame nature, until a glorious martyrdom finiſhed his courſe. But ORIGEN ſurpaſſed all others in diligence and aſſiduity, and his famous *Hexapla*, though almoſt entirely deſtroyed by the waſte of time, will, even in its fragments, remain an eternal monument of the incredible application with which that great man laboured to remove thoſe obſtacles which retarded the progreſs of the goſpel [*f*].

Origen's method of interpreting the ſcriptures.

V. After the encomiums we have given to ORIGEN, who has an undoubted right to the firſt place among the interpreters of the ſcriptures in this century, it is not without a deep concern that we are obliged to add, that he alſo, by an unhappy method, opened a ſecure retreat for all ſorts of errors, that a wild and irregular imagination could bring forth. Having entertained a notion that it was extremely difficult, if not impoſſible, to defend every thing contained in the ſacred writings from the cavils of heretics and infidels, ſo long as they were explained *literally*, according to the real import of the terms, he had recourſe to the fecundity of a lively imagination, and maintained that the holy ſcriptures were to be interpreted in the ſame *allegorical* manner, that the Platoniſts explained the hiſtory of the gods. In conſequence of this pernicious rule of interpretation, he alleged that the words of ſcripture were, in many places, abſolutely void of ſenſe; and that though in others there were, indeed, certain notions conveyed under the outward terms according to their literal force and import, yet it was not in theſe that the true meaning of the ſacred writers was to be ſought, but in a myſterious and hidden ſenſe ariſing from the nature of the things themſelves [g]. This *hidden ſenſe* he endeavours to inveſtigate throughout his *commentaries*, neglecting and deſpiſing, for the moſt part, the *outward letter*; and in this devious path he diſplays the moſt ingenious ſtrokes of fancy, though always at the expence of truth, whoſe divine ſimplicity is ſcarcely diſcernible through the cobweb-veil of allegory [h]. Nor did the inventions of ORIGEN end here. He divided this *hidden ſenſe*, which he purſued with ſuch eagerneſs, into *moral*, and *myſtical* or *ſpiritual*. The *moral* ſenſe of ſcripture diſplays thoſe doctrines that relate to the inward ſtate of the ſoul and the conduct of life. The *myſtical*, or *ſpiritual*, *ſenſe* repreſents the nature, the laws, and the hiſtory of the *ſpiritual* or *myſtical world*. We are not yet at the end of the labyrinth; for he ſubdivided this *myſtical* world of his own creation into two diſtinct regions, the one of which he called the *ſuperior*, i. e. *heaven*; and the other the *inferior*, by which he meant the *church*. This led to another diviſion of the *myſtical ſenſe* into an earthly or *allegorical* ſenſe, adapted to the inferior world, and a celeſtial or *anagogetical* one, adapted to the *ſuperior* region. This chimerical method of explaining the ſcripture was, before ORIGEN, received by many Chriſtians, who were deluded into it by the example of the Jews. But as this learned man reduced it into a ſyſtem, and founded it upon fixed and determinate rules, he is, on that account, commonly conſidered as its principal author.

[*d*] The life of this hermit was written by JEROM.

[*e*] See the travels of LUCAS, in the year 1714, ſecond volume, p. 363.

[*f*] The fragments that yet remain of ORIGEN's *Hexapla*, were collected and publiſhed, by the learned MONTFAUCON, in folio, at *Paris*, in 1713. See alſo upon this head BUDDEI *Iſagoge in Theolog.* tom. ii. p. 1581. and CARPZOVII *Critic. Sacr. Veter. Teſtam.* p. 574.

---

[g] For a further illuſtration of this matter, the reader may conſult the excellent Preface of de la RUE, to the ſecond volume of the works of ORIGEN, publiſhed in folio at *Paris*, in the year 1733. An accurate and full account of ORIGEN's method of interpreting the ſcripture may be found in the work, intitled, *Commentar. de rebus Chriſtian. ante Conſtantinum M.* p. 629. Where the philoſophy and theology of that great man, and his controverſy with DEMETRIUS biſhop of *Alexandria*, are treated of profeſſedly, and at large.

[h] ORIGEN, in his *Stromata*, book x. expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: "The "ſource of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or *external* part of ſcripture. Thoſe "who do ſo, ſhall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, ſeek after the ſpirit "and the ſubſtantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and myſterious." And again: "The "ſcriptures are of little uſe to thoſe who underſtand them, as they are written." One would think it impoſſible, that ſuch expreſſions ſhould drop from the pen of a wiſe man. But the philoſophy, which this great man embraced with ſuch zeal, was one of the ſources of his deluſion. He could not find in the bible the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that ſacred book according to its literal ſenſe. But PLATO, ARISTOTLE, ZENO, and, indeed, the whole philoſophical tribe, could not fail to obtain, for their ſentiments, a place in the goſpel, when it was interpreted by the wanton inventions of fancy, and upon the ſuppoſition of a *hidden ſenſe*, to which it was poſſible to give all ſorts of forms. Hence all, who deſired to model Chriſtianity according to their fancy or their favourite ſyſtem of philoſophy, embraced ORIGEN's method of interpretation.

VI. A pro-

Other interpreters.

VI. A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and the ſucceeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with ſome variations; nor could the few, who explained the ſacred writings with judgment, and a true ſpirit of criticiſm, oppoſe, with any ſucceſs, the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the church. The *commentaries* of Hippolytus, which are yet extant, ſhew manifeſtly, that this good man was entirely addicted to the ſyſtem of Origen, and the ſame judgment may be hazarded concerning Victorinus's *explications* of certain books of the Old and New Teſtament, though theſe explications are, long ſince, loſt. The *tranſlation of the Eccleſiaſtes* by Gregory Thaumaturgus, which is yet remaining, is not cheargeable with this reproach, notwithſtanding the tender and warm attachment of its author to Origen. The book of *Geneſis*, and *the Song of Solcmon* were explained by Methodius, whoſe work is loſt; and Ammonius compoſed a *Harmony of the Goſpels*.

Didactic writers in theology.

VII. The doctrinal part of theology employed the pens of many learned men in this century. In his *Stromata*, and his *four books of Elements*, Origen illuſtrated the greateſt part of the doctrines of Chriſtianity, or, to ſpeak more properly, rather diſguiſed them under the lines of a vain philoſophy. Theſe books of *elements*, or *principles*, were the firſt ſketch that appeared of the *ſcholaſtic* or *philoſophical theology*. Something of the ſame nature was attempted by Theognostus, in his *ſeven books of Hypotypoſes*, which are only known at preſent by the extracts of them in Photius, who repreſents them as the work of one who was infected with the notions of Origen. Gregory Thaumaturgus drew up a brief ſummary of the Chriſtian religion, in his *Expoſition of the faith*; and many treated, in a more ample manner, particular points of doctrine in oppoſition to the enemies and corruptors of Chriſtianity. Thus Hippolytus wrote concerning the *deity*, the *reſurrection*, *anti-chriſt*, and the *end of the world*; Methodius, concerning *free-will*; and Lucian, concerning *faith*. It is doubtful in what claſs theſe productions are to be placed, as the moſt of them have periſhed among the ruins of time.

Moral writers.

VIII. Among the moral writers, the firſt place, after Tertullian, of whom we have already ſpoken above, is due to Cyrpian, a prelate of eminent merit, who publiſhed ſeveral treatiſes concerning *patience*, *mortality*, *works*, *alms*, as alſo an *exhortation* to *martyrdom*. In theſe diſſertations, there are many excellent things; but there runs through them all a general want of order, preciſion, and method; nor do we always find ſolid proofs in favour of the deciſions they contain [i]. Origen has written many treatiſes of this kind, and among others, an *exhortation* to ſuffer martyrdom for the truth; a ſubject handled by many authors in this century, but with unequal eloquence and penetration. Methodius treated of *chaſtity*, in a work intitled, *Sympoſium virginum*, or, the *feaſt of virgins*; but this treatiſe is full of confuſion and diſorder. Dionysius handled the doctrine of *pennance* and *temptations*. The other moral writers of this period are too obſcure and trivial to render the mention of them neceſſary.

[i] See Barbeyrac, *De la Morale des peres*, ch. viii. p. 104.

Polemic divines.

IX. The controverſial writers were exceeding numerous in this century. The Pagans were attacked, and that, in a victorious manner, by MINUCIUS FELIX, in his dialogue called *Octavius*; by ORIGEN, in his writings againſt CELSUS; by ARNOBIUS, in his *ſeven books againſt the Gentiles*; and CYPRIAN, in his treatiſe concerning the *vanity of idols*. The *chronicle* of HIPPOLYTUS, in oppoſition to the Gentiles; and the work of METHODIUS againſt PORPHYRY, that bitter adverſary of the Chriſtians, are both loſt.

We may alſo reckon, in the number of the Polemic writers, thoſe who wrote againſt the philoſophers, or who treated any ſubjects that were diſputed between different ſects. Such was HIPPOLYTUS, who wrote againſt PLATO, and who alſo treated the niceſt, the moſt difficult, and the moſt controverted ſubjects, ſuch as *fate*, *free-will*, and the *origin of evil*, which exerciſed, likewiſe, the pens of METHODIUS and other acute writers. What HIPPOLYTUS wrote againſt the Jews, is not come down to our times; but the work of CYPRIAN, upon that ſubject, yet remains [*k*]. ORIGEN, VICTORINUS, HIPPOLYTUS attacked, in general, all various ſects and hereſies that divided the church, but their labours, in that immenſe field, have entirely diſappeared; and as to thoſe, who only turned their controverſial arms againſt ſome few ſects, and certain particular doctrines, we think it not neceſſary to enumerate them here.

The vicious method of controverſy now employed.

X. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve, that the methods now uſed of defending Chriſtianity, and attacking judaiſm, and idolatry, degenerated much from the primitive ſimplicity, and the true rule of controverſy. The Chriſtian doctors, who had been educated in the ſchools of the rhetoricians and ſophiſts, raſhly employed the arts and evaſions of their ſubtle maſters in the ſervice of Chriſtianity; and intent only upon defeating the enemy, they were too little attentive to the means of victory, indifferent whether they acquired it by artifice or plain-dealing. This method of diſputing, which the ancients called *œconomical* [*l*], and which had victory for its object, rather than truth, was, in conſequence of the prevailing taſte for rhetoric and ſophiſtry, almoſt univerſally approved. The Platoniſts contributed to the ſupport and encouragement of this ungenerous method of diſputing, by that maxim of theirs which aſſerted the innocence of defending the truth by artifice and falſhood. This will appear manifeſt to thoſe who have red, with any meaſure of penetration and judgment, the arguments of ORIGEN againſt CELSUS, and thoſe of the other Chriſtian diſputants againſt the idolatrous Gentiles. The method of TERTULLIAN, who uſed to plead preſcription againſt erroneous doctors, was not, perhaps, unfair in this century; but they muſt be much unacquainted both with the times, and, indeed, with the nature of things, who imagine that it is always allowable to employ this method [*m*].

[(*k*) This work is intitled, *Teſtimonia contra Judæos*.]

[*l*] SOUVERAIN *Platoniſm devoilé*, p. 244. DAILLE, *De vero uſu Patrum*, lib. i. p. 160. JO. CHRISTOPH. WOLFII *Caſauboniana*, p. 100. Concerning the famous rule, *to do a thing*, *κατ᾽ οἰκονομίαν*, or *œconomically*, ſee particularly the ample illuſtrations of GATAKER, *ad Marci Antonini* lib. xi. p. 330, &c.

[(*m*) We ſcarely know any caſe, in which the plea of *preſcription* can be admitted as a ſatisfactory argument, in favour of religious tenets or articles of faith, unleſs by *preſcription* be meant,

XI. This

Suppoſititious or ſpurious writings.

XI. This diſingenuous and vicious method of ſurprizing their adverſaries by artifice, and ſtriking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced, among other diſagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falſely attributed to certain great men, in order to give theſe ſpurious productions more credit and weight. For, as the greateſt part of mankind are leſs governed by reaſon than by authorities, and prefer, in many caſes, the deciſions of fallible mortals to the unerring dictates of the divine word, the diſputants, of whom we are now ſpeaking, thought they could not ſerve the truth more effectually than by oppoſing illuſtrious names and reſpectable authorities to the attacks of its adverſaries. Hence, the book of *canons*, which certain artful men aſcribed falſely to the apoſtles; hence, the *apoſtolical conſtitutions*, of which CLEMENT, biſhop of *Rome*, is ſaid to have formed a collection; hence the *recognitions* and the *clementina*, which are alſo attributed to CLEMENT [*n*], and many other productions of that nature, which, for a long time, were too much eſteemed by credulous men.

Nor were the managers of controverſy the only perſons who employed theſe ſtratagems; the Myſtics had recourſe to the ſame pious frauds to ſupport their ſect. And accordingly, when they were aſked from what chief their eſtabliſhment took its riſe, to get clear of this perplexing queſtion, they feigned a chief, and choſe, for that purpoſe, DIONYSIUS the Areopagite, a man of almoſt apoſtolical weight and authority, who was converted to Chriſtianity, in the firſt century, by the preaching of St. PAUL at *Athens*. And to render this fiction more ſpecious, they attributed to this great man various treatiſes concerning the *monaſtic life*, the *myſtic theology*, and other ſubjects of that nature, which were the productions of ſome ſenſeleſs and inſipid writers of after times. Thus it happened, through the pernicious influence of human paſſions, which too often mingle themſelves in the execution of the beſt purpoſes and the moſt upright intentions, that they, who were deſirous of ſurpaſſing all others in piety, looked upon it as lawful, and even laudable, to advance the cauſe of piety by artifice and fraud.

Controverſy concerning the millennium.

XII. The moſt famous controverſies that divided the Chriſtians, during this century, were thoſe concerning the *millennium*, or *reign of a thouſand years*; the *baptiſm of heretics*, and the *doctrine of* ORIGEN.

Long before this period, an opinion had prevailed that CHRIST was to come and reign a thouſand years among men, before the entire and final diſſolution of this world. This opinion, which had hitherto met with no oppoſition, was differently interpreted by different perſons, nor did all promiſe themſelves the ſame kind of enjoyments in that future and glorious king-

---

a doctrine's being eſtabliſhed in the time and by the authority of the apoſtles. In all other caſes, *preſcription* is no argument at all: it cannot recommend *error*, and *truth* has no need of its ſupport.]

[(*n*) It is not with the utmoſt accuracy, that Dr. MOSHEIM places the *recognitions* among the ſpurious works of antiquity, ſince they are quoted by ORIGEN, EPIPHANIUS, and RUFFIN, as the work of CLEMENT. It is true indeed, that theſe writers own them to have been altered in ſeveral places, and falſified by the heretics; and EPIPHANIUS, particularly, tells us, that the Ebionites ſcarcely left any thing ſound in them. As to the *Clementina*, they were undoubtedly ſpurious.]

dom.

dom [o]. But in this century its credit began to decline, principally through the influence and authority of ORIGEN, who oppoſed it with the greateſt warmth, becauſe it was incompatible with ſome of his favourite ſentiments [p]. NEPOS, an Egyptian biſhop, endeavoured to reſtore this opinion to its former credit, in a book written *againſt the allegoriſts*, for ſo he called, by way of contempt, the adverſaries of the Millenarian ſyſtem. This work, and the Hypotheſis it defended, were extremely well received by great numbers in the canton of *Arſinoë*; and among others by CORACION, a preſbyter of no mean influence and reputation. But DIONYSIUS of *Alexandria*, a diſciple of ORIGEN, ſtopped the growing progreſs of this doctrine by his private diſcourſe, and alſo by two learned and judicious diſſertations concerning the *divine promiſes* [q].

Concerning the baptiſm of heretics.

XIII. The diſputes concerning the *baptiſm of heretics* were not carried on with that amiable ſpirit of candor, moderation, and impartiality with which DIONYSIUS oppoſed the MILLENNIAN doctrine. The warmth and violence that were exerted in this controverſy, were far from being edifying to ſuch as were acquainted with the true genius of Chriſtianity, and with that meekneſs and forbearance that ſhould particularly diſtinguiſh its doctors.

As there was no expreſs law which determined the manner and form, according to which thoſe who abandoned the heretical ſects were to be received into the communion of the church, the rules practiſed in this matter were not the ſame in all Chriſtian churches. Many of the Oriental and African Chriſtians placed recanting heretics in the rank of catechumens, and admitted them, by *baptiſm*, into the communion of the faithful; while the greateſt part of the European churches, conſidering the baptiſm of heretics as valid, uſed no other forms in their reception than the *impoſition of hands*, accompanied with ſolemn prayer. This diverſity prevailed for a long time without kindling contentions or animoſities. But, at length, charity waxed cold, and the fire of eccleſiaſtical diſcord broke out. In this century, the Aſiatic Chriſtians came to a determination in a point that was hitherto, in ſome meaſure, undecided; and in more than one council eſtabliſhed it as a law, that all heretics were to be baptized before their admiſſion to the communion of the true church [r]. When STEPHEN, biſhop of *Rome*, was informed of this determination, he behaved with the moſt unchriſtian violence and arrogance towards the Aſiatic Chriſtians, broke communion with them, and excluded them from the communion of the church of *Rome*. Theſe haughty proceedings made no impreſſion upon CYPRIAN biſhop of *Carthage*, who, notwithſtanding the menaces of the Roman pontif, aſſembled a council on

---

[(o) See the learned *Treatiſe concerning the true millennium*, which Dr. WHITBY has ſubjoined to the ſecond volume of his *Commentary upon the New Teſtament*. See alſo, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millenarians, the fourth, fifth, ſeventh, and ninth volumes of LARDNER's *Credibility*, &c.]

[p] See ORIGEN. *De principiis*, lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 104. tom. i. Opp.

[q] See EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxiv. p. 271; as alſo GENNADIUS, *De dogmatibus Eccleſiaſticis*, cap. lv. p. 32. edit. Elmenhorſt.

[r] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. v. vii. FIRMILIANUS, *Epiſtol. ad Cyprianum*, printed among CYPRIAN's *Letters*, Lett. lxxv.

this occaſion, adopted, with the reſt of the African biſhops, the opinion of the Aſiatics, and gave notice thereof to the imperious STEPHEN. The fury of the latter was redoubled at this notification, and produced many threatenings and invectives againſt CYPRIAN, who replied, with great force and reſolution, and, in a ſecond council held at *Carthage*, declared the baptiſm, adminſtred by heretics, void of all efficacy and validity. Upon this, the choler of STEPHEN ſwelled beyond meaſure, and, by a decree full of invectives, which was received with contempt, he excommunicated the African biſhops, whoſe moderation on the one hand, and the death of their imperious antagoniſt on the other, put an end to this violent controverſy [*s*].

Diſputes concerning Origen.

XIV. The controverſy concerning ORIGEN was ſet in motion by DEMETRIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, animated, as ſome ſay, by a principle of envy and hatred againſt this learned man, with whom he had formerly lived in an intimate friendſhip. The aſſertion, however, of thoſe who attribute the oppoſition of DEMETRIUS to this odious principle, appears ſomething more than doubtful; for, in the whole of his conduct towards ORIGEN, there are no viſible marks of envy, though many indeed of paſſion and arrogance, of violence and injuſtice. The occaſion of all this was as follows: In the year 228, ORIGEN having ſet out for *Achaia*, was, in his journey thither, received with ſingular marks of affection and eſteem by the biſhops of *Cæſarea* and *Jeruſalem*, who ordained him *preſbyter* by impoſition of hands. This proceeding gave high offence to DEMETRIUS, who declared ORIGEN unworthy of the prieſthood, becauſe he had caſtrated himſelf, and maintained, at the ſame time, that it was not lawful to advance, to a higher dignity, the principal of the *Alexandrian* ſchool, which was under his epiſcopal inſpection, without his knowledge and approbation. A concluſion, however, was put to theſe warm debates, and ORIGEN returned to *Alexandria*. This calm was, indeed, but of a ſhort duration, being ſoon ſucceeded by a new breach between him and DEMETRIUS, the occaſion of which is not known, but which grew to ſuch a height as obliged ORIGEN, in the year 231, to abandon his charge at *Alexandria*, and retire to *Cæſarea*. His abſence, however, did not appeaſe the reſentment of DEMETRIUS, who continued to perſecute him with the utmoſt violence. To ſatisfy fully his vengeance againſt ORIGEN, he aſſembled two councils, in the firſt of which he condemned him unheard, and deprived him of his office; and in the ſecond, had him degraded from the ſacerdotal dignity. It is probable, that in one of theſe councils, eſpecially the latter, DEMETRIUS accuſed him of erroneous ſentiments in matters of religion; for it was about this time that ORIGEN publiſhed his *book of principles*, which contains ſeveral opinions of a dangerous tendency [*t*]. The

---

[*s*] CYPRIAN. *Epiſt.* lxx. p. 124. lxxiii. p. 129. AUGUSTIN. *De Baptiſmo contra Donatiſtas*, lib. vi, vii. tom. ix. Opp. where are to be found the acts of the council of *Carthage*, A. D. 256. PRUD. MARANI *vita Cypriani*, p. 107.

[(*t*) This work, which was a ſort of introduction to theology, has only come down to us in the tranſlation of RUFFINUS, who corrected and maimed it in order to render it more conformable to the orthodox doctrine of the church than ORIGEN had left it. It contains however, even in its preſent form, ſeveral bold and ſingular opinions, ſuch as the pre-exiſtence of ſouls, and their fall into mortal bodies, in conſequence of their deviation from the laws of order in their firſt greateſt part of the Chriſtian biſhops approved of the proceedings of the Alexandrian council, againſt which the biſhops of the churches of *Achaia*, *Paleſtine*, *Phœnicia*, and *Arabia*, declared, at the ſame time, the higheſt diſpleaſure [u].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

I. ALL the records of this century mention the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Chriſtian church. Several of the cauſes that contributed to this have been already pointed out, to which we may add as a principle one, the paſſion which now reigned for the Platonic philoſophy, or rather, for the popular, Oriental ſuperſtition concerning *demons*, adopted by the Platoniſts, and borrowed, unhappily, from them by the Chriſtian doctors. For there is not the leaſt doubt, but that many of the rites now introduced into the church, derived their origin from the reigning opinions concerning the nature of *demons*, and the *powers* and *operations* of *inviſible beings*. Hence the uſe of *exorciſms* and *ſpells*, the frequency of *faſts*, and the averſion to *wedlock*. Hence the cuſtom of avoiding all connexions with thoſe who were not as yet baptized, or who lay under the penalty of excommunication, as perſons ſuppoſed to be under the dominion of ſome malignant ſpirit. And hence the rigour and ſeverity of that diſcipline and penance that were impoſed upon thoſe who had incurred, by their immoralities, the cenſures of the church [w].

Public worſhip.

II. In moſt of the provinces there were, at this time, certain fixed places ſet apart for public worſhip among the Chriſtians, as will appear evident to every impartial inquirer into theſe matters. Nor is it abſolutely improbable, that theſe churches were, in ſeveral places, embelliſhed with images and other ornaments.

With reſpect to the form of divine worſhip, and the times appointed for its celebration, there were little innovations made in this century. Two things, however, deſerve to be taken notice of here: the firſt is, that the diſcourſes or ſermons, addreſſed to the people, were very different from thoſe of the

---

ſtate, and the final reſtoration of all intelligent beings to order and happineſs. RUFFINUS, in his apology for ORIGEN, alleges, that his writings were maliciouſly falſified by the heretics; and that, in conſequence thereof, many errors were attributed to him, which he did not adopt; as alſo that the opinions, in which he differed from the doctrines of the church, were only propoſed by him as curious conjectures.]

[u] The accounts here given of the perſecution of ORIGEN, are drawn from the moſt early and authentic ſources, ſuch as EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. vi. cap. xxiv. PHOTIUS, *Bibl. Cod.* cxviii. JEROM's *Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, and from ORIGEN himſelf; and they differ in ſome reſpects from thoſe, which common writers, ſuch as DOUCIN, HUET, and others give of this matter.

[w] For an ampler account of this matter, the reader may conſult PORPHYRY's treatiſe concerning *Abſtinence*, and compare what that writer has ſaid on this ſubject, with the cuſtoms received among the Chriſtians. Several curious things are alſo to be found in THEODORET and EUSEBIUS upon this head.

the earlier times of the church, and degenerated much from the ancient ſimplicity. For, not to ſay any thing of ORIGEN, who introduced long ſermons, and was the firſt who explained the ſcriptures in his diſcourſes, ſeveral biſhops, who had received their education in the ſchools of the rhetoricians, were exactly ſcrupulous in adapting their public exhortations and diſcourſes to the rules of Grecian eloquence. And this method gained ſuch credit, as to be ſoon, almoſt univerſally, followed. The ſecond thing that we propoſed to mention as worthy of notice is, that, about this time, the uſe of *incenſe* was introduced, at leaſt, into many churches. This has been denied by ſome men of eminent learning; the fact, however, is rendered evident by the moſt unexceptionable teſtimonies [*x*].

Adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper.

III. Several alterations were now introduced, in the celebration of the Lord's ſupper, by thoſe who had the direction of divine worſhip. The prayers uſed, upon this occaſion, were lengthened; and the ſolemnity and pomp, with which this important inſtitution was celebrated, were conſiderably increaſed, no doubt, with a pious intention to render it ſtill more reſpectable. Thoſe who were in a *penitential ſtate*, and thoſe alſo who had not received the ſacrament of baptiſm, were not admitted to this holy ſupper; and it is not difficult to perceive, that theſe excluſions were an imitation of what was practiſed in the heathen myſteries. We find, by the accounts of PRUDENTIUS [*y*] and others, that gold and ſilver veſſels were now uſed in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper; nor is there any reaſon why we ſhould not adopt this opinion, ſince it is very natural to imagine that thoſe churches, which were compoſed of the moſt opulent members, would readily indulge themſelves in this piece of religious pomp. As to the time of celebrating this ſolemn ordinance, it muſt be carefully obſerved, that there was a conſiderable variation in different churches ariſing from their different circumſtances, and founded upon reaſons of prudence and neceſſity. In ſome, it was celebrated in the morning; in others, at noon; and in others, in the evening. It was alſo more frequently repeated in ſome churches, than in others; but was conſidered in all as of the higheſt importance and as eſſential to ſalvation, for which reaſon it was even thought proper to adminiſter it to infants. The ſacred feaſts, that accompanied this venerable inſtitution, preceded its celebration in ſome churches, and followed it in others.

Baptiſm.

IV. There were, twice a year, ſtated times, when baptiſm was adminiſtred to ſuch as, after a long courſe of trial and preparation, offered themſelves as candidates for the ſublime profeſſion of Chriſtianity. This ceremony was performed only in the preſence of ſuch as were already initiated into the Chriſtian myſteries. The remiſſion of ſins was thought to be its immediate and happy fruit; while the biſhop, by prayer and the impoſition of hands, was ſuppoſed to confer thoſe ſanctifying gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, that are neceſſary to a life of righteouſneſs and virtue [*z*]. We have already mentioned the principal rites that were uſed in the adminiſtration of baptiſm; and we have only to add, that none were admitted to this ſolemn ordinance, until, by the menacing and formidable ſhouts and declamation of the *exorciſt*, they had been delivered from the dominion of the prince of darkneſs, and conſecrated to the ſervice of God. The origin of this ſuperſtitious ceremony may be eaſily traced, when we conſider the prevailing opinions of the times. The Chriſtians, in general, were perſuaded, that rational ſouls, deriving their exiſtence from God, muſt conſequently be in themſelves pure, holy, and endowed with the noble principles of liberty and virtue. But, upon this ſuppoſition, it was difficult to account for the corrupt propenſities and actions of men, any other way than by attributing them either to the malignant nature of *matter*, or the influence and impulſe of ſome *evil ſpirit*, who was perpetually compelling them to ſin. The former of theſe opinions was embraced by the Gnoſtics, but was rejected by true Chriſtians, who denied the eternity of matter, conſidered it as a creature of God, and therefore adopted the latter notion, that in all vicious perſons there was a certain *evil being*, the author and ſource of their corrupt diſpoſitions and their unrighteous deeds [*a*]. The driving out this *demon* was now conſidered as an eſſential preparation for baptiſm, after the adminiſtration of which the candidates returned home, adorned with crowns and arrayed in white garments, as ſacred emblems; the former, of their victory over ſin and the world; the latter, of their inward purity and innocence.

[*x*] See biſhop BEVEREGE *ad Canon.* iii *Apoſtol.* p. 461; as alſo another work of the ſame author, intitled, *Codex Canon. vindicatus*, p. 78.

[*y*] Περὶ ϛεφαν. *Hymn.* ii. p. 60. edit. Heinſii.

[*z*] That ſuch was the notion prevalent at this time is evident from teſtimonies of ſufficient

V. *Faſting* began now to be held in more eſteem than it had formerly been; a high degree of ſanctity was attributed to this practice, and it was even looked upon as of indiſpenſable neceſſity, from a notion that the *demons* directed their ſtratagems principally againſt thoſe who pampered themſelves with delicious fare, and were leſs troubleſome to the lean and the hungry, who lived under the ſeverities of a rigorous abſtinence [*b*]. The Latins, contrary to the general cuſtom, faſted the ſeventh day of the week; and as the Greeks and Orientals refuſed to follow their example here, this afforded a new ſubject of contention between them.

Prayers.

The Chriſtians offered up their ordinary prayers at three ſtated times of the day, *viz.* At the *third*, the *ſixth*, and the *ninth hour*, according to the cuſtom

---

weight. And as this point is of great conſequence in order to our underſtanding the theology of the ancients, which differs from ours in many reſpects, we ſhall mention one of theſe teſtimonies, even that of CYPRIAN, who, in his lxxiii Letter, expreſſes himſelf thus: "It is manifeſt, where, and by whom, the REMISSION OF SINS, which is CONFERRED in BAPTISM, is "adminiſtered.—They who are preſented to the rulers of the church, OBTAIN, by our "prayers and impoſition of hands, the HOLY GHOST." See alſo EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. viii.

[*a*] It is demonſtrably evident, that *exorciſm* was added to the other baptiſmal rites in the third century, after the introduction of the Platonic philoſophy into the church. For, before this time, we hear no mention made of it. JUSTIN Martyr, in his *ſecond apology*, and TERTULLIAN, in his book concerning the *military crown*, give us an account of the ceremonies uſed in baptiſm during the ſecond century, without any mention of *exorciſm*. This is a very ſtrong argument of its being poſterior to theſe two great men; and is every way proper to perſuade us, that it made its entrance into the Chriſtian church in the third century, and probably firſt in *Egypt*.

[*b*] CLEMENTIN. *Homil.* ix. § 9. p. 688. PORPHYR. *De abſtinentia*, lib. iv. p. 417.

obſerved among the Jews. But, beſides theſe ſtated devotions, true believers were aſſiduous in their addreſſes to the ſupreme being, and poured forth frequently their vows and ſupplications before his throne, becauſe they conſidered prayer as the moſt eſſential duty, as well as the nobleſt employment of a ſanctified nature. At thoſe feſtivals, which recalled the memory of ſome joyful event, and were to be celebrated with expreſſions of thankſgiving and praiſe, they prayed ſtanding, as they thought that poſture the fitteſt to expreſs their joy and their confidence. On days of contrition and faſting, they preſented themſelves upon their knees before the throne of the moſt high, to expreſs their profound humiliation and ſelf-abaſement. Certain forms of prayer were, undoubtedly, uſed in many places both in public and in private; but many alſo expreſſed their pious feelings in the natural effuſions of an un-premeditated eloquence.

The ſign of the croſs used by Chriſtians.

The *ſign of the croſs* was ſuppoſed to adminiſter a victorious power over all ſorts of trials and calamities, and was more eſpecially conſidered as the ſureſt defence againſt the ſnares and ſtratagems of malignant ſpirits. And hence it was, that no Chriſtian undertook any thing of moment, without arming himſelf with the influence of this triumphant ſign.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Remains of the ancient ſects.

I. THE ſame ſects that in the former ages had produced ſuch diſorder and perplexity in the Chriſtian church, continued in this to create new troubles and to foment new diviſions. The Montaniſts, Valentinians, Marcionites, and the other Gnoſtics continued ſtill to draw out their forces, notwithſtanding the repeated defeats they had met with; and their *obſtinacy* remained even when their *ſtrength* was gone, as it often happens in religious controverſy. Adelphius and Aquilinus, who were of the Gnoſtic tribe, endeavoured to inſinuate themſelves and their doctrine into the eſteem of the public, at *Rome* and in other places in *Italy* [c]. They were, however, oppoſed not only by the Chriſtians, but alſo by Plotinus, the greateſt Platonic philoſopher of this age, who, followed by a numerous train of diſciples, oppoſed theſe two chimerical teachers, and others of the ſame kind, with as much vigour and ſucceſs, as the moſt enlightened Chriſtians could have done. The philoſophical opinions which this faction entertained concerning the ſupreme being, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and ſeveral other ſubjects, were entirely oppoſite to the doctrines of Plato. Hence the diſciples of Jesus, and the followers of Plotinus, joined together their efforts againſt the progreſs of gnoſticiſm; and there is no doubt, but that their united force ſoon deſtroyed the credit and authority of this fantaſtic ſect, and rendered it contemptible in the eſtimation of the wiſe [d].

---

[c] Porphyr. *vita Plotini*, cap. xvi. p. 118.

[d] Plotinus's book againſt the Gnoſtics is extant in his works *Ennead.* ii. lib. ix. p. 213.

II. While

Manes and the Manichæans.

II. while the Chriſtians were ſtruggling with theſe corrupters of the truth, and upon the point of obtaining a complete and deciſive victory, a new enemy, more vehement and odious than the reſt, ſtarted up ſuddenly, and engaged in the conteſt. This was MANES (or MANICHÆUS, as he ſometimes is called by his diſciples) by birth a Perſian; educated among the Magi, and himſelf one of that number before he embraced the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. Inſtructed in all thoſe arts and ſciences, which the Perſians, and the other neighbouring nations, held in the higheſt eſteem, he had penetrated into the depths of aſtronomy in the midſt of a rural life; ſtudied the art of healing, and applied himſelf to painting and philoſophy. His genius was vigorous and ſublime, but redundant and ungoverned; and his mind, deſtitute of a proper temperature, ſeemed to border on fanaticiſm and madneſs. He was ſo adventurous as to attempt a coalition of the doctrine of the Magi, with the Chriſtian ſyſtem, or rather the explication of the one by the other: and, in order to ſucceed in this audacious enterprize, he affirmed that CHRIST had left the doctrine of ſalvation unfiniſhed and imperfect, and that he was the *comforter*, whom the departing Saviour had promiſed to his diſciples to lead them to all truth. Many were deceived by the eloquence of this enthuſiaſt, by the gravity of his countenance, and the innocence and ſimplicity of his manners; ſo that, in a ſhort time, he formed a ſect not utterly inconſiderable in point of number. He was put to death by VARANES I, king of the Perſians; though hiſtorians are not agreed concerning the cauſe, the time, and the manner of his execution [*e*].

His doctrine of two principles.

III. The doctrine of MANES was a motley mixture of the tenets of Chriſtianity, with the ancient philoſophy of the Perſians, which he had been inſtructed in during his youth. He combined theſe two ſyſtems, and applied and accommodated to JESUS CHRIST the characters and actions which the Perſians attributed to the god MITHRAS. The principal doctrines of MANES are comprehended in the following ſummary:

“ There are two principles from which all things proceed: the one is a moſt *pure and ſubtile matter*, called LIGHT; and the other a *groſs and corrupt ſubſtance*, called DARKNESS. Each of theſe are ſubject to the dominion of a ſuperintending BEING, whoſe exiſtence is from all eternity. The

---

[(*e*) Some allege, that MANES, having undertaken to cure the ſon of the Perſian monarch of a dangerous diſeaſe, by his medicinal art, or his miraculous power, failed in the attempt, precipitated the death of the prince, and thus incurring the indignation of the king his father, was put to a cruel death. This account is ſcarely probable, as it is mentioned by none of the Oriental writers cited by D'HERBELOT, and as BAR HEBRÆUS ſpeaks of it in terms, which ſhews that it was only an uncertain rumour. The death of MANES is generally attributed to to another cauſe by the Oriental writers. They tell us, that MANES (after having been protected, in a ſingular manner, by HORMIZDAS, who ſucceeded SAPOR on the Perſian throne, but who was not, however, able to defend him, at length, againſt the united hatred of the Chriſtians, the Magi, the Jews, and the Pagans) was ſhut up in a ſtrong caſtle, which HORMIZDAS had erected between *Bagdad* and *Suza*, to ſerve him as a refuge againſt thoſe who perſecuted him on account of his doctrine. They add, that, after the death of HORMIZDA'S, VARANES I. his ſucceſſor, firſt protected MANES, but afterwards gave him up to the fury of the Magi, whoſe reſentment againſt him was due to his having adopted the Sadducean principles, as ſome ſay; while others attribute it to his having mingled the tenets of the Magi with the doctrines of Chriſtianity.]

"Being, who preſides over the Light, is called God; He that rules the *land of* Darkness, bears the title of Hyle, or Demon. The Ruler of the Light, is ſupremely happy, and, in conſequence thereof, benevolent and good: the Prince of Darkness is unhappy in himſelf, and deſiring to render others partakers of his miſery, is evil and malignant. Theſe Two Beings have produced an immenſe multitude of creatures, reſembling themſelves, and diſtributed them through their reſpective provinces.

Concerning man.

IV. "The Prince of Darkness knew not, for a long ſeries of ages, that Light exiſted in the univerſe, and no ſooner perceived it, by the means of a war that was kindled in his dominions, than he bent his endeavours towards the ſubjecting it to his empire. The Ruler of the Light oppoſed to his efforts an army commanded by the *firſt man*, but not with the higheſt ſucceſs; for the generals of the Prince of Darkness ſeized upon a conſiderable portion of the celeſtial elements and of the Light itſelf, and mingled them in the maſs of corrupt matter. The ſecond general of the Ruler of the Light, whoſe name was the *living ſpirit*, made war with more ſucceſs againſt the Prince of Darkness, but could not entirely diſengage the pure particles of the celeſtial matter from the corrupt maſs through which they had been diſperſed. The Prince of Darkness, after his defeat, produced the firſt parents of the human race. The beings engendred from this original ſtock, conſiſt of a body formed out of the corrupt matter of the kingdom of Darkness, and of two ſouls, one of which is *ſenſitive* and *luſtful*, and owes its exiſtence to the *evil principle*; the other *rational* and *immortal*, a particle of that divine Light, which was carried away by the army of Darkness, and immerſed into the maſs of malignant matter.

Concerning Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt.

V. "Mankind being thus formed by the Prince of Darkness, and thoſe minds, that were the productions of the eternal Light, being united to their mortal bodies, God created the earth out of the corrupt maſs of matter, by that *living ſpirit*, who had vanquiſhed the Prince of Darkness. The deſign of this creation was to furniſh a dwelling for the human race, to deliver, by degrees, the captive ſouls from their corporeal priſons, and to extract the celeſtial elements from the groſs ſubſtance in which they were involved. In order to carry this deſign into execution, God produced *two beings* of eminent dignity from his own ſubſtance, which were to lend their auſpicious ſuccours to impriſoned ſouls; one of theſe ſublime entities was Christ; and the other, the Holy Ghost. Christ is that glorious intelligence, which the Perſians called *Mithras*: he is a moſt ſplendid ſubſtance, conſiſting of the brightneſs of the eternal Light: ſubſiſting in and by himſelf; endowed with life; enriched with infinite wiſdom; and his reſidence is in the ſun. The Holy Ghost is alſo a luminous and animated body, diffuſed throughout every part of the atmoſphere, which ſurrounds this terreſtrial globe. This *genial principle* warms and illuminates the minds of men, renders alſo the earth fruitful, and draws forth gradually from its boſom the latent particles of celeſtial fire, which it wafts up on high to their primitive ſtation.

Concerning the office of Chriſt.

Concerning the comforter.

VI. “ After that the SUPREME BEING had, for a long time, admoniſhed and exhorted the captive ſouls, by the miniſtry of the angels and of holy men raiſed up and appointed for that purpoſe, he ordered CHRIST to leave the ſolar regions, and to deſcend upon earth, in order to accelerate the return of thoſe impriſoned ſpirits to their celeſtial country. In obedience to this divine command, CHRIST appeared among the Jews, cloathed with the ſhadowy form of a human body, and not with the real ſubſtance. During his miniſtry, he taught mortals how to diſengage the rational ſoul from the corrupt body, to conquer the violence of malignant matter, and he demonſtrated his divine miſſion by ſtupendous miracles. On the other hand, the PRINCE OF DARKNES uſed every method to enflame the Jews againſt this divine meſſenger, and incited them, at length, to put him to death upon an ignominious croſs; which puniſhment, however, he ſuffered not in reality, but only in appearance and in the opinion of men. When CHRIST had fulfilled the purpoſes of his miſſion, he returned to his throne in the ſun, and appointed a certain number of choſen apoſtles to propagate through the world the religion he had taught during the courſe of his miniſtry. But, before his departure, he promiſed, that, at a certain period of time, he would ſend an apoſtle ſuperior to all others in eminence and dignity, whom he called the *paraclete*, or *comforter*, who ſhould add many things to the precepts he had delivered, and diſpel all the errors under which his ſervants laboured concerning divine things. This *comforter*, thus expreſly promiſed by CHRIST, is MANES, the Perſian, who, by the order of the MOST HIGH, declared to mortals the whole doctrine of ſalvation, without exception, and without concealing any of its truths, under the veil of metaphor, or any other covering.

Concerning the purification of ſouls, and their future condition.

VII. “ Thoſe ſouls, who believe JESUS CHRIST to be the ſon of GOD, renounce the worſhip of the God of the Jews, who is the PRINCE OF DARKNESS, obey the laws delivered by CHRIST, as they are enlarged and illuſtrated by the *comforter*, MANES, and combat, with perſevering fortitude, the luſts and appetites of a corrupt nature, derive from this faith and obedience the ineſtimable advantage of being gradually purified from the contagion of matter. The total purification of ſouls cannot, indeed, be accompliſhed during this mortal life. Hence it is, that the ſouls of men, after death, muſt paſs through two ſtates more of probation and trial, by *water* and *fire*, before they can aſcend to the regions of LIGHT. They mount, therefore, firſt into the moon, which conſiſts of benign and ſalutary *water*; from whence, after a luſtration of fifteen days, they proceed to the ſun, whoſe purifying *fire* removes entirely all their corruption, and effaces all their ſtains. The bodies, compoſed of malignant matter which they have left behind them, return to their firſt ſtate, and enter into their original maſs.

Concerning the fate of unpurified ſouls.

VIII. “ On the other hand, thoſe ſouls who have neglected the ſalutary work of their purification, paſs, after death, into the bodies of animals, or other natures, where they remain until they have expiated their guilt and accompliſhed their probation. Some, on account of their peculiar obſtinacy “and perverſeneſs, paſs through a ſeverer courſe of trial, being delivered over, for a certain time, to the power of malignant, aërial ſpirits, who torment them in various ways. When the greateſt part of the captive ſouls are reſtored to liberty and to the regions of light, then a devouring fire ſhall break forth, at the divine command, from the caverns in which it is at preſent confined, and ſhall deſtroy and conſume the frame of the the world. After this tremendous event, the PRINCE and *powers of darkneſs* ſhall be forced to return to their primitive ſeats of anguiſh and miſery, in which they ſhall dwell for ever. For, to prevent their ever renewing this war in the regions of *light*, GOD ſhall ſurround the manſions of DARKNESS with an invincible guard, compoſed of thoſe ſouls who have fallen irrecoverably from the hopes of ſalvation, and who ſet in array, like a military band, ſhall ſurround thoſe gloomy ſeats of woe, and hinder any of their wretched inhabitants from coming forth again to the *light*.”

The opinion of Manes concerning the Old and New Teſtament.

IX. In order to remove the ſtrongeſt obſtacles that lay againſt the belief of this monſtrous ſyſtem, MANES rejected almoſt all the ſacred books in which Chriſtians look for the ſublime truths of their holy religion. He affirmed, in the firſt place, that the Old Teſtament was not the work of God, but of the prince of darkneſs, who was ſubſtituted by the Jews in the place of the true God. He maintained further, that the *Four Goſpels*, which contain the hiſtory of CHRIST, were not written by the apoſtles, or, at leaſt, that they were corrupted and interpolated by deſigning and artful men, and were augmented with Jewiſh fables and fictions. He therefore ſupplied their place by a *goſpel*, which, he ſaid, was dictated to him by God himſelf, and which he diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Erteng*. He rejected alſo the *Acts of the Apoſtles:* and though he acknowledged the *epiſtles*, that are attributed to St. PAUL, to be the productions of that divine apoſtle, yet he looked upon them as conſiderably corrupted and falſified in a variety of paſſages. We have not any certain account of the judgment he formed concerning the other books of the New Teſtament.

His rule of life ſeverely ſober.

X. The rule of life and manners that MANES preſcribed to his diſciples was moſt extravagantly rigorous and auſtere. He commanded them to mortify and macerate the body, which he looked upon as *intrinſically* evil and *eſſentially* corrupt; to deprive it of all thoſe objects which could contribute either to its conveniency or delight; to extirpate all thoſe deſires that lead to the purſuit of external objects; and to diveſt themſelves of all the paſſions and inſtincts of nature. Such was the unnatural rule of practice which this enormous fanatic preſcribed to his followers; but foreſeeing, at the ſame time, that his ſect could not poſſibly become numerous, if this ſevere manner of living was to be impoſed without diſtinction upon all his adherents, he divided his diſciples into *two* claſſes; the *one* of which comprehended the perfect Chriſtians, under the name of the *elect*; and the other, the imperfect and feeble, under the title of *hearers*. The *elect* were obliged to a rigorous and entire abſtinence from fleſh, eggs, milk, fiſh, wine, all intoxicating drink, wedlock, and all amorous gratifications; and to live in a ſtate of the ſharpeſt penury, nouriſhing their ſhrivelled and emaciated bodies with bread, herbs,

Diviſion of his diſciples.

pulſe, and melons, and depriving themſelves of all the comforts that ariſe from the moderate indulgence of natural paſſions, and alſo from a variety of innocent and agreeable purſuits. The diſcipline, appointed for the *hearers*, was of a milder nature. They were allowed to poſſeſs houſes, lands, and wealth; to feed upon fleſh, to enter into the bonds of conjugal tenderneſs; but this liberty was granted them with many limitations, and under the ſtricteſt conditions of moderation and temperance.

The general aſſembly of the Manicheans was headed by a preſident, who repreſented JESUS CHRIST. There were joined to him *twelve rulers*, or *maſters*, who were deſigned to repreſent the *twelve apoſtles*; and theſe were followed by *ſeventy two biſhops*, the images of the *ſeventy two diſciples* of our Lord. Theſe biſhops had *preſbyters* and *deacons* under them, and all the members of theſe religious orders were choſen out of the claſs of the *elect* [*f*].

The ſect of the Hieracites.

XI. The ſect of the Hieracites was formed in *Egypt*, towards the concluſion of this century, by HIERAX of *Leontium*, a bookſeller by profeſſion, and diſtinguiſhed eminently by his extenſive learning and a venerable air of ſanctity and virtue. Some have conſidered this as a branch of the Manichean ſect, but without foundation, ſince, notwithſtanding the agreement of MANES and HIERAX in ſome points of doctrine, it is certain, that they differed in many reſpects. HIERAX maintained, that the principal object of CHRIST's office and miniſtry was the promulgation of a *new law*, more ſevere and perfect than that of MOSES; and from hence he concluded, that the uſe of fleſh, wine, wedlock, and of other things agreeable to the outward ſenſes, which had been permitted under the Moſaic diſpenſation, was abſolutely prohibited and abrogated by CHRIST. If, indeed, we look attentively into his doctrine, we ſhall find that, like MANES, he did not think that theſe auſtere acts of ſelf-denial were impoſed by CHRIST indiſcriminately upon all, but on ſuch only as were ambitious of aſpiring to the higheſt ſummit of virtue. To this capital error he added many others, which were partly the conſequences of this illuſion, and were, in part, derived from other ſources. He excluded, for example, from the kingdom of heaven, children who died before they had arrived to the uſe of reaſon, and that upon the ſuppoſition that God was bound to adminiſter the rewards of futurity to thoſe only who had fairly finiſhed their victorious conflict with the body and its luſts. He maintained alſo that MELCHISEDEC, king of *Salem*, who bleſſed ABRAHAM, was the Holy Ghoſt; denied the reſurrection of the body, and caſt a cloud of obſcurity over the ſacred ſcriptures by his allegorical fictions [*g*].

The Noetian controverſy.

XII. The controverſies relating to the divine trinity, which took their riſe, in the former century, from the introduction of the Grecian philoſophy into the Chriſtian church, were now ſpreading with conſiderable vigour, and producing various methods of explaining that inexplicable doctrine. One of the firſt who engaged in this idle and perilous attempt of explaining what every mortal muſt acknowledge to be incomprehenſible, was NOETUS, of *Smyrna*, an obſcure man, and of mean abilities. He affirmed, that the Supreme God, whom he called the *Father*, and conſidered as abſolutely indiviſible, united himſelf to the man CHRIST, whom he called the *Son*, and was born, and crucified with him. From this opinion NOETUS, and his followers, were diſtinguiſhed by the title of Patripaſſians, *i. e.* perſons who believe that the ſupreme father of the univerſe, and not any other divine perſon had expiated the guilt of the human race. And, indeed, this appellation belongs to them juſtly, if the accounts which ancient writers give us of their opinions be accurate and impartial [*h*].

[*f*] See all this amply proved in the work, intitled, *Commentarii de rebus Chriſtianorum ante Conſtantinum Magnum*.

[*g*] EPIPHAN. *Hæreſ.* lxvii. *Hieracitarum*, p. 710, &c.

Sabellius.

XIII. About the middle of this century aroſe SABELLIUS, an African biſhop or preſbyter, who, in *Pentapolis*, a province of *Cyrenaica*, and in *Ptolemais*, or *Barce*, its principal city, explained, in a manner very little different from that of NOETUS, the doctrine of ſcripture concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. This dogmatiſt had a conſiderable number of followers, who adhered to him, notwithſtanding that his opinions were refuted by DIONYSIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*. His ſentiments were, in ſome reſpects, different from thoſe of NOETUS; the latter was of opinion, that the *perſon* of the father had aſſumed the human nature of CHRIST; whereas SABELLIUS maintained that a certain *energy* only proceeding from the ſupreme parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature, was united to the ſon of God, the man JESUS, and he conſidered, in the ſame manner, the *Holy Ghoſt*, as a portion of the everlaſting father [*i*]. From hence it appears, that the Sabellians, though they might with juſtice be called Patripaſſians, were yet called ſo, by the ancients, in a different ſenſe from that in which this name was given to the Noetians.

Beryllus.

XIV. At this ſame period BERYLLUS an Arabian, biſhop of *Bozrah*, and a man of eminent piety and learning, taught that CHRIST, before his birth, had no proper ſubſiſtence, nor any other divinity, than that of the father; which opinion, when conſidered with attention, amounts to this: that CHRIST did not exiſt before MARY, but that a *ſpirit* iſſuing from God himſelf, and therefore ſuperior to all human ſouls, as being a portion of the divine nature, was united to him, at the time of his birth. BERYLLUS, however, was refuted by ORIGEN, with ſuch a victorious power of argument and zeal, that he yielded up the cauſe, and returned into the boſom of the church [*k*].

Paul of Samoſata.

XV. PAUL of *Samoſata*, biſhop of *Antioch*, and alſo a magiſtrate or civil judge, was very different from the pious and candid BERYLLUS, both in point of morals and doctrine. He was a vain and arrogant man, whom riches had rendered inſolent and ſelf-ſufficient [*l*]. He introduced much confuſion and trouble into the eaſtern churches, by his new explication of the doctrine of the goſpel concerning the divine nature and CHRIST, and left behind him a ſect, that aſſumed the title of Paulians, or Paulianiſts. As far as we can judge of his doctrine, by the accounts of it that have been tranſmitted to us, it ſeems to have amounted to this: "That the *Son* and the "*Holy Ghoſt* exiſt in *God* in the ſame manner, as the faculties of *reaſon* and "*activity* do in man: that CHRIST was born a mere man; but that the *reaſon* "or *wiſdom* of the father deſcended into him, and by him wrought miracles "upon earth, and inſtructed the nations: and finally, that, on account of this "union of the *divine word* with the *man* JESUS, CHRIST might, though improperly, be called *God*.

[*h*] See the *Diſcourſe of* HIPPOLYTUS *againſt the Hereſy of* NOETUS, in the ſecond volume of his works, publiſhed by FABRICIUS. As alſo, EPIPHAN. *Hæreſ.* lvii. tom. i. p. 479. THEODORET. *Hæret. Fabul.* lib. iii. cap. iii. p. 227. tom. iv. Opp.

[*i*] Almoſt all the hiſtorians, who give accounts of the ancient hereſies, have made particular mention of SABELLIUS. Among others, fee EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. c. vi. p. 252. ATHANAS. *Libro de ſententia Dionyſii.* All the paſſages of the ancient authors, relating to SABELLIUS, are carefully collected by the learned CHRISTOPHER WORMIUS, in his *Hiſtoria Sabelliana*, printed in 8^{vo} at *Francfort* and *Leipſick*, 1696.

[*k*] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xx. p. 222. cap. xxxiii. p. 231. HIERONYM. *Catalog. Scriptor. Eccleſ.* cap. lx. p. 137. SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. vii. p. 174; and among the moderns, LE CLERC, *Ars Critica*, vol. i. part II. § 1. cap. xiv. p. 293. CHAUFFEPIED *Nouveau Diction. Hiſt. Crit.* tom. i. p. 268.

Such were the real ſentiments of PAUL. He involved them, however, in ſuch deep obſcurity by the ambiguous forms of ſpeech he made uſe of to explain and defend them, that, after ſeveral meetings of the councils held to examine his errors, they could not convict him of hereſy. At length, indeed, a council was aſſembled in the year 269, in which MALCHION, the rhetorician, drew him forth from his obſcurity, detected his evaſions, and expoſed him in his true colours; in conſequence of which he was degraded from the epiſcopal order [*m*].

Abſurdities of ſome Arabian philoſophers.

XVI. It was not only in the point now mentioned, that the doctrine of the goſpel ſuffered, at this time, from the erroneous fancies of wrong-headed doctors. For there ſprung up now, in *Arabia*, a certain ſort of minute philoſophers, the diſciples of a maſter, whoſe obſcurity has concealed him from the knowledge of after-ages, who denied the immortality of the ſoul, believed that it periſhed with the body, but maintained, at the ſame time, that it was to be again recalled to life with the body, by the power of God. The philoſophers, who held this opinion, were called Arabians from their country. ORIGEN was called from *Egypt*, to make head againſt this riſing ſect, and diſputed againſt them, in a full council, with ſuch remarkable ſucceſs, that they abandoned their erroneous ſentiments, and returned to the received doctrine of the church.

The troubles excited in the church by the Novatians.

XVII. Among the ſects that aroſe in this century, we place that of the Novatians the laſt. This ſect cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Chriſtianity by their opinions; their crime was, that by the unreaſonable ſeverity of their diſcipline, they gave occaſion to the moſt deplorable diviſions, and made an unhappy rent in the church. NOVATIAN, a preſbyter of the church of *Rome*, a man alſo of uncommon learning and eloquence, but of an auſtere and rigid character, entertained the moſt unfavourable ſentiments of thoſe who had been ſeparated from the communion of the church. He indulged his inclination to ſeverity ſo far, as to deny that ſuch as had fallen into the commiſſion of grievous tranſgreſſions, eſpecially thoſe who had apoſtatized from the faith, under the perſecution ſet on foot by Decius, were to be again received into the boſom of the church. The greateſt part of the preſbyters were of a different opinion in this matter, eſpecially Cornelius, whoſe credit and influence were raiſed to the higheſt pitch by the eſteem and admiration which his eminent virtues ſo naturally excited. Hence it happened, that when a biſhop was to be choſen, in the year 250, to ſucceed Fabianus in the ſee of *Rome*, Novatian oppoſed the election of Cornelius, with the greateſt activity and bitterneſs. His oppoſition, however, was in vain, for Cornelius was choſen to that eminent office of which his diſtinguiſhed merit rendered him ſo highly worthy. Novatian, upon this, ſeparated himſelf from the juriſdiction of Cornelius, who, in his turn, called a council at *Rome* in the year 251, and cut off Novatian and his partiſans from the communion of the church. This turbulent man, being thus excommunicated, erected a new ſociety, of which he was the firſt biſhop, and which, on account of the ſeverity of its diſcipline, was followed by many, and flouriſhed, until the fifth century, in the greateſt part of thoſe provinces which had received the goſpel. The chief perſon who aſſiſted Novatian, in this enterprize, was Novatus, a Carthaginian preſbyter, a man of no principles, who, during the heat of this controverſy, had come from *Carthage* to *Rome*, to eſcape the reſentment and excommunication of Cyprian, his biſhop, with whom he was highly at variance.

[*l*] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxx. p. 279.

[*m*] *Epiſtol. Concil. Antioch. ad Paulum in Bibliotheca Patrum.* tom. xi. p. 302. *Dionyſi Alex. Ep. ad Paulum,* ib. p. 273. *Decem Pauli Samoſateni Quæſtiones,* ib. p. 278.

The ſeverity of the Novatians against the lapſed.

XVIII. There was no difference in point of doctrine, between the Novatians and other Chriſtians. What peculiarly diſtinguiſhed them was, their refuſing to re-admit to the communion of the church thoſe who, after baptiſm, had fallen into the commiſſion of heinous crimes, though they did not pretend, that even ſuch were excluded from all poſſibility or hopes of ſalvation. They conſidered the Chriſtian church as a ſociety where virtue and innocence reigned univerſally, and none of whoſe members, from their entrance into it, had defiled themſelves with any enormous crime; and, of conſequence, they looked upon every ſociety, which re-admitted heinous offenders to its communion, as unworthy of the title of a true Chriſtian church. It was from hence alſo, that they aſſumed the title of *Cathari*, i. e. the *pure*; and, what ſhewed ſtill a more extravagant degree of vanity and arrogance, they obliged ſuch as came over to them from the general body of Chriſtians, to ſubmit to be baptized a ſecond time, as a neceſſary preparation for entering into their ſociety. For ſuch deep root had their favorite opinion concerning the irrevocable rejection of heinous offenders taken in their minds, and ſo great was its influence upon the ſentiments they entertained of other Chriſtian ſocieties, that they conſidered the baptiſm adminiſtred in thoſe churches, which received the lapſed to their communion, even after the moſt ſincere and undoubted repentance, as abſolutely diveſted of the power of imparting the remiſſion of ſins [n].

---

[n] Eusebius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vi. cap. xliii. p. 242. Cyprianus *variis Epiſtolis*, xlix. lii, &c. Albaspinæus, *Obſervat. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. xx, xxi. Jos. Aug. Orsi, *De criminum capital. inter veteres Chriſtianos abſolutione*, p. 254. Kenckel, *De hæreſi Novatiana.*

The End *of the* First Book.

A

COMPENDIOUS VIEW

OF

Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

BOOK THE SECOND.

CONTAINING THE

STATE of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH

From the TIME of

CONSTANTINE the GREAT to CHARLEMAGNE.

THE
FOURTH CENTURY.

PART I.
The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.
Concerning the proſperous and calamitous events which happened to the church during this century.

I. THAT I may not ſeparate facts, which are intimately connected with each other, I have judged it expedient to combine, in the ſame chapter, the proſperous and calamitous events that happened to the church during this century, inſtead of treating them ſeparately, as I have hitherto done. This combination, which preſents things in their natural relations, as cauſes or effects, is, undoubtedly, the principal circumſtance that renders hiſtory truly intereſting. In following, however, this plan, the order of time ſhall alſo be obſerved with as much accuracy as this intereſting combination of events will admit of.

The church enjoys peace at the entrance of this century.

In the beginning of this century, the Roman empire was under the dominion of four chiefs, of whom two, DIOCLETIAN and MAXIMIAN HERCULEUS, were of ſuperior dignity, and were diſtinguiſhed each by the title of AUGUSTUS; while the other two, *viz.* CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS and MAXIMINUS GALERIUS, were in a certain degree of ſubordination to the former, and were honoured with the appellation of CÆSARS. Under theſe four emperors, the church enjoyed an agreeable calm [a]. DIOCLETIAN, though much addicted to ſuperſtition, did not, however, entertain any averſion to the Chriſtians: and CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS, who, following the dictates of right reaſon alone in the worſhip of the deity, had abandoned the abſurdities of polytheiſm, treated them with condeſcenſion and benevolence. This alarmed the Pagan prieſts, whoſe intereſts were ſo cloſely connected with the continuance of the ancient ſuperſtitions, and who apprehended not without reaſon, that, to their great detriment, the Chriſtian religion would become daily more univerſal and triumphant throughout the empire. Under theſe anxious fears of the downfal of their authority, they addreſſed themſelves to DIOCLETIAN, whom they knew to be of a timorous and credulous diſpoſition, and, by fictitious oracles and other ſuch perfidious ſtratagems, endeavoured to engage him to perſecute the Chriſtians [*b*].

---

[a] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. i. p. 291, &c.

The perſecution under Diocletian.

II. DIOCLETIAN, however, ſtood, for ſome time, unmoved by the treacherous arts of a ſelfiſh and ſuperſtitious prieſthood, who, when they perceived the ill ſucceſs of their cruel efforts, addreſſed themſelves to MAXIMINUS GALERIUS, one of the CÆSARS, and alſo ſon-in-law to DIOCLETIAN, in order to accompliſh their unrighteous purpoſes. This prince, whoſe groſs ignorance of every thing but military affairs, was accompanied with a fierce and ſavage temper, was a proper inſtrument for executing their deſigns. Set on, therefore, by the malicious inſinuations of the heathen prieſts, the ſuggeſtions of a ſuperſtitious mother, and the ferocity of his own natural diſpoſitions, he ſollicited DIOCLETIAN with ſuch indefatigable importunity, and in ſuch an urgent manner, for an edict againſt the Chriſtians, that he, at length, obtained his horrid purpoſe. For in the year 303, when this emperor was at *Nicomedia*, an order was obtained from him to pull down the churches of the Chriſtians, to burn all their books and writings, and to take from them all their civil rights and privileges, and render them incapable of any honours or civil promotion [*c*]. This firſt edict, though rigorous and ſevere, extended not to the lives of the Chriſtians, for DIOCLETIAN was extremely averſe to ſlaughter and blood-ſhed; it was, however, deſtructive to many of them, particularly to thoſe who refuſed to deliver the ſacred books into the hands of the magiſtrates [*d*]. Many Chriſtians therefore, and among them ſeveral biſhops and preſbyters, ſeeing the conſequences of this refuſal, delivered up all the religious books and other ſacred things that were in their poſſeſſion, in order to ſave their lives. This conduct was highly condemned by the moſt ſteddy and reſolute Chriſtians, who looked upon this compliance as ſacrilegious, and branded thoſe who were guilty of it with the ignominious appellation of *traditors* [*e*].

The cauſes and ſeverity of this perſecution.

III. Not long after the publication of this firſt edict againſt the Chriſtians, a fire broke out, at two different times, in the palace of NICOMEDIA, where GALERIUS lodged with DIOCLETIAN. The Chriſtians were accuſed, by their enemies, as the authors of this [*f*]; and the credulous DIOCLETIAN, too eaſily perſuaded of the truth of this charge, cauſed vaſt numbers of them to ſuffer, at *Nicomedia*, the puniſhment of incendiaries, and to be tormented in the moſt inhuman and infamous manner [g]. About the ſame time, there aroſe certain tumults and ſeditions in *Armenia* and in *Syria*, which were alſo attributed to the Chriſtians by their irreconcileable enemies, and dexterouſly made uſe of to arm againſt them the emperor's fury. And accordingly Diocletian, by a new edict, ordered all the biſhops and miniſters of the Chriſtian church to be caſt into priſon. Nor did his inhuman violence end here; for a third edict was ſoon iſſued out, by which it was ordered, that all ſorts of torments ſhould be employed, and the moſt inſupportable puniſhments invented to force theſe venerable captives to renounce their profeſſion by ſacrificing to the heathen gods [h]; for it was hoped, that, if the biſhops and doctors of the church could be brought to yield, their reſpective flocks would be eaſily induced to follow their example. An immenſe number of perſons illuſtriouſly diſtinguiſhed by their piety and learning, became the victims of this cruel ſtratagem throughout the whole Roman empire, *Gaul* excepted, which was under the mild and equitable dominion of Constantius Chlorus [i]. Some were puniſhed in ſuch a ſhameful manner, as the rules of decency oblige us to paſs in ſilence; ſome were put to death after having had their conſtancy tried by tedious and inexpreſſible tortures; and ſome were ſent to the mines to draw out the remains of a miſerable life in poverty and bondage.

[*b*] EUSEBIUS, *De vita Conſtantini*, lib. ii. cap. l. p. 467. LACTANTII *Inſtitut. divin.* lib. iv. cap. xxvii. p. 393. Idem, *De mortibus perſequutor.* cap. x. p. 943. edit. Heumann.

[*c*] LACTANTIUS, *De mortibus perſequutor.* c. xi. p. 944. EUSEBIUS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. ii. p. 293, &c.

[*d*] AUGUSTINUS *Breviculo collat. cum Donatiſtis*, cap. xv. xvii. p. 387. 390. tom. ix. Opp. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. ii. p. 77. 92.

[*e*] OPTATUS MILEVIT. *De Schiſmate Donatiſtar.* lib. i. § xiii. p. 13, &c. edit. Pinian.

[(*f*) LACTANTIUS aſſures us, that GALERIUS cauſed fire to be privately ſet to the palace, that he might lay the blame of it upon the Chriſtians, and by that means incenſe DIOCLETIAN ſtill more againſt them; in which horrid ſtratagem he ſucceeded, for never was any perſecution ſo bloody and inhuman, as that which this credulous emperor now ſet on foot againſt them].

The affairs of the Chriſtians reduced to a dangerous criſis.

IV. In the ſecond year of this horrible perſecution, the 304th of the Chriſtian era, a fourth edict was publiſhed by Diocletian, at the inſtigation of Galerius, and the other inveterate enemies of the Chriſtian name. By it the magiſtrates were ordered and commiſſioned to force all Chriſtians, without diſtinction of rank or ſex, to ſacrifice to the gods, and were authorized to employ all ſorts of torments in order to drive them to this act of apoſtaſy [k]. The diligence and zeal of the Roman magiſtrates, in the execution of this inhuman edict, had like to have proved fatal to the Chriſtian cauſe [l].

Galerius now made no longer a myſtery of the ambitious project he had been revolving in his mind. Finding his ſcheme ripe for execution, he obliged Diocletian and Maximian Herculeus to reſign the imperial dignity, and declared himſelf emperor of the eaſt; leaving in the weſt Constantius Chlorus, with the ill ſtate of whoſe health he was well acquainted. He choſe collegues according to his own fancy, and rejecting the propoſal of Diocletian, who recommended Maxentius, and Constantine the ſon of Constantius, to that dignity; his choice fell upon Severus and Daza, his ſiſter's ſon, to whom he had, a little before, given the name of Maximin [m]. This revolution reſtored peace to thoſe Chriſtians, who lived in the weſtern provinces, under the adminiſtration of Constantius [n]; while thoſe of the eaſt, under the tyranny of GALERIUS, had their ſufferings and calamities dreadfully augmented [o].

---

[g] Euseb. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. viii. c. vi p. 297. Lactant. *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xiv. p. 948. Constantinus M. *Oratio ad ſanctor. cœtum*, cap. xxv. p. 601.

[h] Euseb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. vii. p. 298. Idem, *De martyribus Palæſtinæ.*

[i] Lactantius, *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xv. p 951. Eusebius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. xiii. p. 309. cap. xviii. p. 317.

[k] Eusebius, *De martyribus Palæſtinæ*, cap. iii. p. 321, &c.

[l] Lactantius, *Inſtitut. divin.* lib. v. cap. xi p. 449.

[m] Lactant. *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xvii. p. 954. cap. xx. p. 961.

[n] Euseb. *De martyribus Palæſtinæ*, cap. xiii. p. 345.

The tranquillity of the church reſtored, by the acceſſion of Conſtantine to the empire,

V. The divine providence, however, was preparing more ſerene and happy days for the church. In order to this, it confounded the ſchemes of GALERIUS, and brought his counſels to nothing. In the year 306, CONSTANTIUS CHLORUS dying in *Britain*, the army ſaluted with the title of AUGUSTUS, his ſon CONSTANTINE, ſurnamed afterwards the GREAT on account of his illuſtrious exploits, and forced him to accept the purple. This proceeding, which muſt have ſtung the tyrant GALERIUS to the heart, he was, nevertheleſs, obliged to bear with patience, and even to confirm with the outward marks of his approbation. Soon after a civil war broke out, the occaſion of which was as follows: MAXIMIN GALERIUS, inwardly enraged at the election of CONSTANTINE by the ſoldiers, ſent him indeed the purple, but gave him only the title of CÆSAR, and created SEVERUS emperor. MAXENTIUS, the ſon of MAXIMIAN HERCULEUS, and ſon-in-law to GALERIUS, provoked at the preference given to SEVERUS, aſſumed the imperial dignity, and found the leſs difficulty in making good this uſurpation, that the Roman people hoped, by his means, to deliver themſelves from the inſupportable tyranny of GALERIUS. Having cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed emperor, he choſe his father MAXIMIAN for his collegue, who, receiving the purple from the hands of his ſon, was univerſally acknowledged in that character by the ſenate and the people. Amidſt all theſe troubles and commotions CONSTANTINE, beyond all human expectation, made his way to the imperial throne.

The weſtern Chriſtians, thoſe of *Italy* and *Africa* excepted [p], enjoyed a tolerable degree of tranquillity and liberty during theſe civil tumults. Thoſe of the eaſt ſeldom continued for any conſiderable time in the ſame ſituation; ſubject to various changes and revolutions; their condition was ſometimes adverſe, and ſometimes tolerably eaſy, according to the different ſcenes that were preſented by the fluctuating ſtate of public affairs. At length, however, MAXIMIN GALERIUS, who had been the author of their heavieſt calamities, being brought to the brink of the grave by a moſt dreadful and lingering diſeaſe, whoſe complicated horrors no language can expreſs, publiſhed, in the year 311, a ſolemn edict, ordering the perſecution to ceaſe, and reſtoring freedom and repoſe to the Chriſtians, againſt whom he had exerciſed ſuch unheard-of cruelties [r].

and by the defeat of Maxentius,

VI. After the death of GALERIUS, his dominions fell into the hands of MAXIMIN and LICINIUS, who divided between them the provinces he had poſſeſſed. At the ſame time, MAXENTIUS, who had uſurped the government of *Africa* and *Italy*, determined to make war upon CONSTANTINE, who was now maſter of *Spain* and the Gauls, and this with the ambitious view of reducing, under his dominion, the whole weſtern empire. CONSTANTINE, appriſed of this deſign, marched, with a part of his army, into *Italy*, gave battle to MAXENTIUS at a ſmall diſtance from *Rome*, and defeated totally that abominable tyrant, who, in his precipitat flight, fell into the *Tiber*, and was drowned. After this victory, which happened in the year 312, CONSTANTINE, and his collegue LICINIUS, immediately granted to the Chriſtians a full power of living according to their own laws and inſtitutions; which power was ſpecified ſtill more clearly in another edict drawn up, at *Milan*, in the following year [s]. MAXIMIN, indeed, who ruled in the eaſt, was preparing new calamities for the Chriſtians, and threatening alſo with deſtruction the weſtern emperors. But his projects were diſconcerted by the victory which LICINIUS gained over his army, and, through diſtraction and deſpair, he ended his life by poiſon in the year 313.

---

[o] LACTANT. *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xxi. p. 964.

[(p) The reaſon of this exception is, that the provinces of *Italy* and *Africa*, though nominally under the government of SEVERUS, were yet in fact ruled by GALERIUS with an iron ſcepter.]

[(q) See a lively deſcription of the diſeaſe of GALERIUS in the *Univerſal Hiſtory*, vol. xv. p. 359. of the *Dublin* edition.]

[r] EUSEB. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. viii. cap. xvi. p. 314. LACTANTIUS, *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xxxiii. p. 981.

Different opinions concerning the faith of Conſtantine.

VII. About the ſame time, CONSTANTINE the GREAT, who had hitherto diſcovered no religious principles of any kind, embraced Chriſtianity, in conſequence, as it is ſaid, of a *miraculous croſs*, which appeared to him in the air, as he was marching towards *Rome* to attack MAXENTIUS. But that this extraordinary event was the reaſon of converſion, is a matter that has never yet been placed in ſuch a light, as to diſpel all doubts and difficulties. For the firſt edict of CONSTANTINE, in favour of the Chriſtians, and many other circumſtances that might be here alleged, ſhew, indeed, that he was well diſpoſed to them and to their worſhip, but are no proof that he looked upon Chriſtianity as the only true religion; which, however, would have been the natural effect of a miraculous converſion. It appears evident, on the contrary, that this emperor conſidered the other religions, and, particularly, that which was handed down from the ancient Romans, as alſo true and uſeful to mankind; and declared it as his intention and deſire, that they ſhould all be exerciſed and profeſſed in the empire, leaving to each individual the liberty of adhering to that which he thought the beſt. CONSTANTINE, it is true, did not remain always in this ſtate of indifference. In proceſs of time, he acquired more extenſive views of the excellence and importance of the Chriſtian religion, and gradually arrived at an entire perſuaſion of its bearing alone the ſacred marks of celeſtial truth, and of a divine origin. He was convinced of the falſhood and impiety of all other religious inſtitutions; and acting in conſequence of this conviction, he exhorted earneſtly all his ſubjects to embrace the goſpel; and, at length, employed all the force of his authority in the abolition of the ancient ſuperſtition. It is not, indeed, eaſy, nor perhaps poſſible, to fix preciſely the time, when the religious ſentiments of CONSTANTINE were ſo far changed, as to render all religions, but that of CHRIST, the objects of his averſion. All that we know, with certainty, concerning this matter is, that this change was firſt publiſhed to the world by the laws and edicts [t] which this emperor iſſued out in the year 324, when, after the defeat and death of LICINIUS, he reigned, without a collegue, ſole lord of the Roman empire. His deſigns, however, with reſpect to the abolition of the ancient religion of the Romans, and the tolerating no other form of worſhip but the Chriſtian, were only made known, towards the latter end of his life, by the edicts he iſſued out for deſtroying the heathen temples and prohibiting ſacrifices [*u*].

---

[s] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. x. cap. v. p. 388. LACTANTIUS, *De mortibus perſequut.* cap. xlviii. p. 1007.

[t] EUSEB. *De vita Conſtant.* lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 453. cap. xliv. p. 464.

Of Conſtantine's ſincerity in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity.

VIII. The ſincerity of CONSTANTINE's zeal for Chriſtianity can ſcarely be doubted, unleſs it be maintained, that the outward actions of men are, in no degree, a proof of their inward ſentiments. It muſt, indeed, be confeſſed, that the life and actions of this prince were not ſuch as the Chriſtian religion demands from thoſe who profeſs to believe its ſublime doctrines. It is alſo certain, that, from his converſion to the laſt period of his life, he continued in the ſtate of a *catechumen*, and was not received by baptiſm into the number of the faithful, until a few days before his death, when that ſacred rite was adminiſtred to him at *Nicomedia*, by EUSEBIUS, biſhop of that place [*w*]. But neither of theſe circumſtances are ſufficient to prove, that he was not entirely perſuaded of the divinity of the Chriſtian religion, or that his profeſſion of the goſpel was an act of pure diſſimulation. For it was a cuſtom with many in this century, to put off their baptiſm to the laſt hour, that thus immediately after receiving by this rite the remiſſion of their ſins, they might aſcend pure and ſpotleſs to the manſions of life and immortality. Nor are the crimes of CONSTANTINE any proof of the inſincerity of his profeſſion, ſince nothing is more evident, though it be ſtrange and unaccountable, than that many who believe, in the firmeſt manner, the truth and divinity of the goſpel, yet violate its laws by repeated tranſgreſſions, and live in contradiction to their own inward principles. Another queſtion of a different nature might be propoſed here, *viz.* Whether motives of a worldly kind did not contribute, in a certain meaſure, to give Chriſtianity, in the eſteem of CONSTANTINE, a preference to all other religious ſyſtems? It is, indeed, probable, that this prince perceived the admirable tendency of the Chriſtian doctrine and precepts to promote the ſtability of government, by preſerving the citizens in their obedience to the reigning powers, and in the practice of thoſe virtues that render a ſtate happy. And he muſt naturally have obſerved, how defective the Roman ſuperſtition was in this important point [*x*].

[*u*] See GODOFRED. *ad codic. Theodoſian.* tom. vi. part. I. p. 290.

[*w*] EUSEBIUS, *De vita Conſtantini*, lib. iv. cap. lxi, lxii. Thoſe, who upon the authority of certain records (whoſe date is modern, and whoſe credit is extremely dubious) affirm, that CONSTANTINE was baptized in the year 324, at *Rome*, by SYLVESTER, the biſhop of that city, are evidently miſtaken. Thoſe, even of the Romiſh church, who are the moſt eminent for their learning and ſagacity, reject this notion. See NORIS. *Hiſt. Donatiſt.* tom. iv. Opp. p. 650. THOM. MARIÆ MAMACHII *Origin. et Antiquit. Chriſtian.* tom. ii. p. 232.

[*x*] See EUSEBIUS, *De vita Conſtant. Lib.* i. cap. xxvii. p. 421.

[It has been ſometimes remarked, by the more eminent writers of the Roman hiſtory, that the ſuperſtition of that people, contrary to what Dr. MOSHEIM here obſerves, had a great influence in keeping them in their ſubordination and allegiance. It is more particularly obſerved, that, in no other nation, the ſolemn obligation of an oath was treated with ſuch reſpect, and fulfilled with ſuch a religious circumſpection, and ſuch an inviolable fidelity. But, notwithſtanding all this, it is certain, that ſuperſtition, if it may be dexterouſly turned to good pur-

A croſs ſeen by him in the air.

IX. The doubts and difficulties that naturally ariſe in the mind, concerning the *miraculous croſs* that CONSTANTINE ſolemnly declared he had ſeen, about noon, in the air, are many and conſiderable. It is eaſy, indeed, to refute the opinion of thoſe, who look upon this prodigy as a cunning fiction invented by the emperor to animate his troops in the enſuing battle, or who conſider the narration as wholly fabulous [y]. The ſentiment alſo of thoſe, who imagine that this pretended croſs was no more than a natural phenomenon in a ſolar halo, is, perhaps, more ingenious, than ſolid and convincing [z]. Nor, in the third place, do we think it ſufficiently proved, that the divine power interpoſed here to confirm the wavering faith of CONSTANTINE by a ſtupendous miracle. The only hypotheſis then, which remains, is, that we conſider this famous croſs as a viſion preſented to the emperor in a dream, with the remarkable inſcription, HAC VINCE, *i. e.* IN THIS CONQUER; and this latter opinion is maintained by authors of conſiderable weight [a] [aa].

---

poſes, may be equally employed to bad. The artifice of an augur, could have rendered ſuperſtition as uſeful to the infernal deſigns of a TARQUIN and a CATILINE as to the noble and virtuous purpoſes of a PUBLICOLA, or a TRAJAN. But true Chriſtianity can animate or encourage to nothing that is not juſt and good. It tends to ſupport government by the principles of piety and juſtice, and not by the ambiguous flight of birds, and ſuch like deluſions.]

[y] HORNBECK. *Comment. ad Bullam Urbani*, viii. *de Imagin. cultu*, p. 182. OISELIUS, *Theſaur. Numiſm. Antiq.* p. 463. TOLLIUS, *Preface to the French Tranſlation of Longinus*, as alſo his *Adnot. ad* LACTANTIUM *de Mort. Perſequut.* cap. xliv. CHRIST. THOMASIUS, *Obſervat. Hallenſ.* tom. i. p. 380.

[z] JO. AND. SCHMIDIUS, *Diſſ. de luna in cruce viſa.* JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Diſſ. de cruce à Conſtantino viſa*, in his *Biblioth. Græca*, vol. vi. cap. i. p. 8, &c.

[(a) This hypotheſis of Dr. MOSHEIM is not more credible than the real appearance of a croſs in the air.—Both events are recorded by the ſame authority. And, if the veracity of CONSTANTINE, or of EUSEBIUS, are queſtioned with reſpect to the appearance of a croſs in the day, they can ſcarcely be confided in with reſpect to the truth of the nocturnal viſion. It is very ſurprizing to ſee the learned authors of the *Univerſal Hiſtory* adopt, without exception, all the accounts of EUSEBIUS concerning this croſs, which are extremely liable to ſuſpicion; which EUSEBIUS himſelf ſeems to have believed but in part, and for the truth of all which he is careful not to make himſelf anſwerable. (See that author *De vita Conſtant.* lib. ii. cap. ix.)

This whole ſtory is attended with difficulties, which render it both as a miracle and as a fact, extremely dubious, to ſay no more.—It will neceſſarily be aſked, whence it comes to paſs, that the relation of a fact, which is ſaid to have been ſeen by the whole army, is delivered, by EUSEBIUS, upon the ſole credit of CONSTANTINE? This is the more unaccountable, that EUSEBIUS lived and converſed with many that muſt have been ſpectators of this event, had it really happened, and whoſe unanimous teſtimony would have prevented the neceſſity of CONSTANTINE's confirming it to him by an oath. The ſole relation of one man, concerning a public appearance, is not ſufficient to give complete conviction; nor does it appear, that this ſtory was generally believed by the Chriſtians or by others, ſince ſeveral eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, who wrote after EUSEBIUS, particularly RUFFIN and SOZOMEN, make no mention of this appearance of a croſs in the heavens. The nocturnal *viſion* was, it muſt be confeſſed, more generally known and believed. Upon which Dr. LARDNER makes this conjecture, that when CONSTANTINE firſt informed the people of the reaſon that induced him to make uſe of the ſign of the croſs in his army, he alleged nothing but a dream for that purpoſe; but that, in the latter part of his life, when he was acquainted with EUSEBIUS, he added the other particular, of a *luminous croſs*, ſeen *ſomewhere* by him and his army in the day time (for the place is not mentioned) and that the emperor having related this in the moſt ſolemn manner, EUSEBIUS thought himſelf obliged to mention it.]

[aa] All the writers, who have given any accounts of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, are care-

The Chriſtians perſecuted by Licinius.

X. The joy, with which the Chriſtians were elated on account of the favourable edicts of CONSTANTINE and LICINIUS, was ſoon interrupted by the war which broke out between theſe two princes. LICINIUS, being defeated in a pitched battle in the year 314, made a treaty of peace with CONSTANTINE, and obſerved it during the ſpace of nine years. But his turbulent ſpirit rendered him an enemy to repoſe, and his natural violence ſeconded, and ſtill further incenſed, by the ſuggeſtions of the heathen prieſts, armed him againſt CONSTANTINE, in the year 324, for the ſecond time. During this war, he endeavoured to engage in his cauſe all thoſe who remained attached to the ancient ſuperſtition, that thus he might oppreſs his adverſary with numbers; and in order to this, he perſecuted the Chriſtians in a cruel manner, and put to death many of their biſhops, after trying them with torments of the moſt barbarous nature [b]. But all his enterprizes proved abortive; for, after ſeveral battles fought without ſucceſs, he was reduced to the neceſſity of throwing himſelf at the victor's feet, and imploring his clemency; which, however, he did not long enjoy, for he was ſtrangled, by the orders of CONSTANTINE, in the year 325. After the defeat of LICINIUS, the empire was ruled by CONSTANTINE alone until his death, and the Chriſtian cauſe experienced, in its happy progreſs, the effects of his auſpicious adminiſtration. This zealous prince employed all the reſources of his genius, all the authority of his laws, and all the engaging charms of his munificence and liberality, to efface, by degrees, the ſuperſtitions of paganiſm, and to propagate Chriſtianity in every corner of the Roman empire. He had learned, no doubt, from the diſturbances continually excited by LICINIUS, that neither himſelf nor the empire could enjoy a fixed ſtate of tranquillity and ſafety as long as the ancient ſuperſtitions ſubſiſted; and therefore, from this period, he openly oppoſed the ſacred rites of paganiſm, as a religion detrimental to the intereſts of the ſtate.

The ſtate of the church under the ſons of Conſtantine the Great.

XI. After the death of CONSTANTINE, which happened in the year 337, his three ſons, CONSTANTINE II, CONSTANTIUS, and CONSTANS, were, in conſequence of his appointment, put in poſſeſſion of the empire, and were all

---

fully enumerated by J. A. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Solut. Evang. toti orbi exor.* cap. xii. p. 260. who alſo mentions, cap. xiii. p. 237. the laws concerning religious matters, which were enacted by this emperor, and digeſted into four parts. For a full account of theſe laws, ſee JAC. GODOFRED. *Adnotat. ad Codic. Theodoſ.* and BALDUINUS, in his *Conſtantin. Magn. ſeu de legibus Conſtantini Eccleſ. et Civilibus*, lib. ii. of which a ſecond edition was publiſhed, at *Hall*, by GUNDLING. in 8^{vo} in the year 1727.

[b] EUSEBIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. x. cap. viii. Id. *De vita Conſtantini*, lib. i. cap. xlix. JULIAN himſelf, whoſe bitter averſion to CONSTANTINE, gives a ſingular degree of credibility to his teſtimony in this matter, could not help confeſſing that LICINIUS was an infamous tyrant, and a profligate abandoned to all ſorts of wickedneſs. See, the *Cæſars of* JULIAN, p. 222. of the French edition, by SPANHEIM. And here I beg leave to make a remark, which has eſcaped the learned, and that is, that AURELIUS VICTOR, in his book *de Cæſaribus*, cap. xli. p. 435. edit. Arntzenii, has mentioned the perſecution under LICINIUS in the following terms: "Licinio ne inſontium quidem ac nobilium philoſophorum ſervili more cruciatus adhibiti "modum fecere." The philoſophers, whom LICINIUS is here ſaid to have tormented, were, doubtleſs, the Chriſtians, whom many, through ignorance, looked upon as a philoſophical ſect. This paſſage of AURELIUS has not been touched by the commentators, who are too generally more intent upon the knowledge of words, than of things.

ſaluted as emperors and Augusti by the Roman ſenate. There were yet living two brothers of the late emperor, *viz.* Constantius Dalmatius and Julius Constantius, and they had ſeveral ſons. Theſe, the ſons of Constantine, ordered to be put to death, leſt their ambitious views ſhould excite troubles in the empire[c], and they all fell victims to this barbarous order, except Gallus and Julian, the ſons of Julius Constantius, the latter of whom roſe afterwards to the imperial dignity. The dominions allotted to Constantine were *Britain*, *Gaul*, and *Spain*; but he did not poſſeſs them long, for having made himſelf maſter, by force, of ſeveral places belonging to Constans, this occaſioned a war between the two brothers, in the year 340, in which Constantine loſt his life. Constans, who had received, at firſt, for his portion *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Africa*, added now the dominions of the deceaſed prince to his own, and thus became ſole maſter of all the weſtern provinces. He remained in poſſeſſion of this vaſt territory until the year 350, when he was cruelly aſſaſſinated by the orders of Magnentius, one of his commanders, who had revolted and declared himſelf emperor. Magnentius, in his turn, met with the fate he deſerved: tranſported with rage and deſpair at his ill ſucceſs in the war againſt Constantius, and apprehending the moſt terrible and ignominious death from the juſt reſentment of the conqueror, he laid violent hands upon himſelf. Thus Constantius, who had, before this, poſſeſſed the provinces of *Aſia*, *Syria*, and *Egypt*, became, in the year 353, ſole lord of the Roman empire, which he ruled until the year 361, when he died at *Mopſucrene*, on the borders of *Cilicia*, as he was marching againſt Julian. None of theſe three brothers poſſeſſed the ſpirit and genius of their father. They all, indeed, followed his example, in continuing to abrogate and efface the ancient ſuperſtitions of the Romans and other idolatrous nations, and to accelerate the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion throughout the empire. This zeal was, no doubt, laudable; its end was excellent; but, in the means uſed to accompliſh it, there were many things worthy of blame.

Julian attempts the deſtruction of Chriſtianity.

XII. This flouriſhing progreſs of the Chriſtian religion was greatly interrupted, and the church reduced to the brink of deſtruction, when Julian, the ſon of Julius Constantius, and the only remaining branch of the imperial family, was placed at the head of affairs. This active and adventurous prince, after having been declared emperor by the army, in the year 380, in conſequence of his exploits among the Gauls, was, upon the death of Constantius the year following, confirmed in the undivided poſſeſſion of the empire. No event could be leſs favourable to the Chriſtians. For though he had been educated in the principles of Chriſtianity, yet he apoſtatized from that divine religion, and employed all his efforts to reſtore the expiring ſuper-

---

[(c) It is more probable, that the principal deſign of this maſſacre was to recover the provinces of *Thrace*, *Macedon*, and *Achaia*, which, in the diviſion of the empire, Constantine the Great had given to young Dalmatius, ſon to his brother of the ſame name, and Pontus and Cappadocia, which he had granted to Annibalianus, the brother of young Dalmatius. Be that as it will, Dr. Mosheim has attributed this maſſacre equally to the three ſons of Constantine; whereas almoſt all authors agree, that neither young Constantine, nor Constans, had any hand in it at all.]

ſtitions of polytheiſm to their former vigour, credit, and luſtre. This apoſtaſy of JULIAN, from the goſpel of CHRIST to the worſhip of the gods, was owing, partly, to his averſion to the CONSTANTINE family, who had embrued their hands in the blood of his father, brother, and kinſmen; and partly, to the artifices of the Platonic philoſophers, who abuſed his credulity, and flattered his ambition by fictitious miracles and pompous predictions. It is true, this prince ſeemed averſe to the uſe of violence in propagating ſuperſtition and ſuppreſſing the truth; nay, he carried the appearances of moderation and impartiality ſo far, as to allow his ſubjects a full power of judging for themſelves in religious matters, and of worſhiping the deity in the manner they thought the moſt rational. But, under this maſk of moderation, he attacked Chriſtianity with the utmoſt bitterneſs, and, at the ſame time, with the moſt conſummate dexterity. By art and ſtratagem he undermined the church, removing the privileges that were granted to Chriſtians and their ſpiritual rulers; ſhutting up the ſchools, in which they taught philoſophy and the liberal arts; encouraging the ſectaries and ſchiſmatics, who brought diſhonour upon the goſpel by their diviſions; compoſing books againſt the Chriſtians, and uſing a variety of other means to bring the religion of JESUS to ruin and contempt. JULIAN extended his views yet further, and was meditating projects of a ſtill more formidable nature againſt the Chriſtian church, which would have felt, no doubt, the fatal and ruinous effects of his inveterate hatred, if he had returned victorious from the Perſian war, which he entered into immediately after his acceſſion to the empire. But in this war, which was raſhly undertaken and imprudently conducted, he fell by the lance of a Perſian ſoldier, and expired in his tent in the 32d year of his age, having reigned, alone, after the death of CONSTANTIUS, twenty months [d].

His character.

XIII. It is to me juſt matter of ſurprize to find JULIAN placed, by many learned and judicious writers [e], among the greateſt heros that ſhine forth in the annals of time; nay, exalted above all the princes and legiſlators, that have been diſtinguiſhed by the wiſdom of their government. Such writers muſt either be too far blinded by prejudice, to perceive the truth: or, they muſt never have peruſed, with any degree of attention, thoſe works of JULIAN that are ſtill extant; or, if neither of theſe be their caſe, they muſt, at leaſt, be ignorant of that which conſtitutes true greatneſs. The real character of JULIAN has few lines of that uncommon merit that has been attributed to it; for, if we ſet aſide his genius, of which his works give no very high idea; if we except, moreover, his military courage, his love of letters, and his acquaintance with that vain and fanatical philoſophy, which was known by the name of modern platoniſm, we ſhall find nothing remaining that is, in any meaſure, worthy of praiſe, or productive of eſteem. Beſides, the qualities now mentioned were, in him, counterbalanced by the moſt opprobrious defects. He was a ſlave to ſuperſtition, than which nothing is a more evident mark of a narrow ſoul, of a mean and abject ſpirit. His thirſt of glory and popular applauſe were exceſſive even to puerility: his credulity and levity ſurpaſs the powers of deſcription: a low cunning and a profound diſſimulation and duplicity had acquired, in his mind, the force of predominant habits; and all this was accompanied with a total and perfect ignorance of true philoſophy [*f*]. So that, though, in ſome things, Julian may be allowed to have excelled the ſons of Constantine the Great, yet it muſt be granted, on the other hand, that he was, in many reſpects, inferior to Constantine himſelf, whom, upon all occaſions, he loads with the moſt licentious invectives, and treats with the utmoſt diſdain.

---

[d] For a full account of this emperor, it will be proper to conſult (beſides TILLEMONT and other common writers) *La vie de Julien, par l'Abbé* BLETTERIE, which is a moſt accurate and elegant production. See alſo, *The life and character of* JULIAN, illuſtrated in ſeven diſſertations, by DES VOEUX. EZECH. SPANHEM. *Præfat. et adnot. ad Opp.* JULIANI; and FABRICII, *Lux Evangel. toti orbi exoriens*, cap. xiv. p. 294.

[e] MONTESQUIEU, in x chapter of the xxiv book of his work, intitled, *L'Eſprit des loix*, ſpeaks of JULIAN in the following terms: "Il n'y a point eu après lui de Prince plus digne de "gouverner des hommes."

The Jews attempt in vain to rebuild the temple of Jeruſalem.

XIV. As Julian affected, in general, to appear moderate in religious matters, unwilling to trouble any on account of their faith, or to ſeem averſe to any ſect or party, ſo to the Jews, in particular, he extended ſo far the marks of his indulgence, as to permit them to rebuild the temple of *Jeruſalem*. The Jews ſet about this important work, from which, however, they were obliged to deſiſt, before they had even begun to lay the foundations of the ſacred edifice. For, while they were removing the rubbiſh, formidable balls of fire, iſſuing out of the ground with a dreadful noiſe, diſperſed both the works and the workmen, and repeated earthquakes filled the ſpectators of this aſtoniſhing phenomenon with terror and diſmay This ſignal event is atteſted in a manner that renders its evidence irreſiſtible [*g*], though, as uſually happens in caſes of that nature, the Chriſtians have embelliſhed it by augmenting raſhly the number of the miracles that are ſuppoſed to have been wrought upon that occaſion. The cauſes of this phenomenon may furniſh matter of diſpute, and learned men have, in effect, been divided upon that point. All, however, who conſider the matter with attention and impartiality, will perceive the ſtrongeſt reaſons for embracing the opinion of thoſe who attribute this event to the almighty interpoſition of the ſupreme being; nor do the arguments offered, by ſome, to prove it the effect of natural cauſes, or thoſe alleged by others to perſuade us that it was the reſult of artifice and impoſture, contain any thing that may not be refuted with the utmoſt facility [*h*].

[(*f*) Nothing can afford a more evident proof of Julian's ignorance of the true philoſophy than his known attachment to the ſtudy of magic, which Dr. Mosheim has omitted in his enumeration of the defects and extravagancies of this prince.]

[*g*] See Jo. Alb. Fabricii, *Lux Evang. toti orbi exoriens*, p. 124. where all the teſtimonies of this remarkable event are carefully aſſembled; ſee alſo Moyle's *Poſthumous works*, p. 101, &c.

[*h*] The truth of this miracle is denied by the famous Basnage, *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, tom. iv. p. 1257. againſt whom Cuper has taken the affirmative, and defended it in his *letters* publiſhed by Bayer, p. 400. A moſt ingenious diſcourſe has been publiſhed lately, in defence of this miracle, by the learned Dr. Warburton, under the title of *Julian*; or, *A diſcourſe concerning the earthquake and firey eruption*, &c. in which the objections of Basnage are particularly examined and refuted.

The ſtate of the church after the death of Julian.

XV. Upon the death of JULIAN, the ſuffrages of the army were united in favour of JOVIAN, who, accordingly, ſucceeded him in the imperial dignity. After a reign of ſeven months, JOVIAN died in the year 364, and, therefore, had not time to execute any thing of importance [i]. The emperors who ſucceeded him, in this century, were VALENTINIAN I, VALENS, GRATIAN, VALENTINIAN II, and HONORIUS, who profeſſed Chriſtianity, promoted its progreſs, and endeavoured, though not all with equal zeal, to root out entirely the Gentile ſuperſtitions. In this they were all ſurpaſſed by the laſt of the emperors who reigned in this century, *viz.* THEODOSIUS the GREAT, who came to the empire in the year 379, and died in the year 395. As long as this prince lived, he exerted himſelf, in the moſt vigorous and effectual manner, in the extirpation of the Pagan ſuperſtitions throughout all the provinces, and enacted ſevere laws and penalties againſt ſuch as adhered to them. His ſons ARCADIUS and HONORIUS purſued with zeal, and, not without ſucceſs, the ſame end; ſo that, towards the concluſion of this century, the Gentile religions declined apace, and had alſo no proſpect left of recovering their primitive authority and ſplendor.

Remains of paganiſm.

XVI. It is true, that notwithſtanding all this zeal and ſeverity of the Chriſtian emperors, there ſtill remained in ſeveral places, and eſpecially in the remoter provinces, temples and religious rites conſecrated to the ſervice of the Pagan deities. And, indeed, when we look attentively into the matter, we ſhall find that the execution of thoſe rigorous laws, that were enacted againſt the worſhipers of the gods, was rather levelled at the multitude, than at perſons of eminence and diſtinction. For it appears, that, both during the reign, and after the death of THEODOSIUS, many of the moſt honourable and important poſts were filled by perſons, whoſe averſion to Chriſtianity, and whoſe attachment to paganiſm, were ſufficiently known. The example of LIBANIUS alone, is an evident proof of this; ſince, notwithſtanding his avowed and open enmity to the Chriſtians, he was raiſed by THEODOSIUS himſelf to the high dignity of prefect, or chief, of the Pretorian guards. It is extremely probable therefore, that in the execution of the ſevere laws enacted againſt the Pagans, there was an exception made in favour of philoſophers, rhetoricians, and military leaders, on account of the important ſervices which they were ſuppoſed to render to the ſtate, and that they of conſequence enjoyed more liberty in religious matters, than the inferior orders of men.

The efforts of the philoſophers againſt Chriſtianity.

XVII. This peculiar regard ſhewn to the philoſophers and rhetoricians, will, no doubt, appear ſurprizing when it is conſidered, that all the force of their genius, and all the reſources of their art were employed againſt Chriſtianity; and that thoſe very ſages, whoſe ſchools were reputed of ſuch utility to the ſtate, were the very perſons who oppoſed the progreſs of the truth with the greateſt vehemence and contention of mind. HIEROCLES, the great ornament of the Platonic ſchool, wrote, in the beginning of this century, two books againſt the Chriſtians, in which he went ſo far as to draw a parallel between Jesus Christ and Apollonius Tyanaeus. This preſumption was chaſtized with great ſpirit, by Eusebius, in a particular treatiſe written expreſly in anſwer to Hierocles. Lactantius takes notice of another philoſopher, who compoſed three books to detect the pretended errors of the Chriſtians [*k*], but does not mention his name. After the time of Constantine the Great, beſides the long and laborious work which Julian wrote againſt the followers of Christ, Himerius [*l*] and Libanius, in their public harangues, and Eunapius, in his lives of the philoſophers, exhauſted all their rage and bitterneſs in their efforts to defame the Chriſtian religion; while the calumnies, that abounded in the diſcourſes of the one, and the writings of the other, paſſed unpuniſhed.

---

[i] See BLETTERIE, *Vie de Jovien*, vol. ii. publiſhed at *Paris* in 1748; in which the *Life of Julian*, by the ſame author, is further illuſtrated, and ſome productions of that emperor tranſlated into French.

The prejudice which the Chriſtian cauſe received from the philoſophers.

XVIII. The prejudice, which the Chriſtian cauſe received, in this century, from the ſtratagems of theſe philoſophers and rhetoricians, who were elated with a preſumptuous notion of their knowledge, and prepoſſeſſed with a bitter averſion to the goſpel, was certainly very conſiderable. Many examples concur to prove this, and, particularly, that of Julian, who was ſeduced by the artifices of thoſe corrupt ſophiſts. The effects of their diſputes and declamations were not, indeed, the ſame upon all; ſome, who aſſumed the appearance of ſuperior wiſdom, and who either, from moderation or indifference, profeſſed to purſue a middle way in theſe religious controverſies, compoſed matters in the following manner: They gave ſo far their ear to the interpretations and diſcourſes of the rhetoricians, as to form to themſelves a middle kind of religion, between the ancient theology and the new doctrine that was now propagated in the empire; and they perſuaded themſelves, that the ſame truths which Christ taught, had been, for a long time, concealed, by the prieſts of the gods, under the veil of ceremonies, fables, and allegorical repreſentations [*m*]. Of this number were Ammianus Marcellinus, a man of ſingular merit; Themistius, an orator highly diſtinguiſhed by his uncommon eloquence and the eminence of his ſtation; Chalcidius, a philoſopher, and others, who were all of opinion, that the two religions, when properly interpreted and underſtood, agreed perfectly well in the main points; and that, therefore, neither the religion of Christ, nor that of the gods, were to be treated with contempt.

[*k*] *Inſtitut. Divin.* lib. v. cap. ii. p. 535.

[*l*] See Photius *Biblioth. Cod.* cap. lxv. p. 355.

[(*m*) This notion, abſurd as it is, has been revived, in the moſt extravagant manner, in a work publiſhed at *Harderwyk*, in *Guelderland*, in the year 1757, by Mr. Struchtmeyer, profeſſor of eloquence and languages in that univerſity. In this work, which bears the title of the Symbolical Hercules, the learned and wrong-headed author maintains (as he had alſo done in a preceding work, intitled, *An explication of the Pagan Theology*) that all the doctrines of Chriſtianity were emblematically repreſented in the heathen mythology; and not only ſo, but that the inventors of that mythology knew that the ſon of God was to deſcend upon earth; believed in Christ as the only fountain of ſalvation; were perſuaded of his future incarnation, death, and reſurrection; and had acquired all this knowledge and faith by the peruſal of a Bible much older than either Moses or Abraham, &c. The Pagan doctors, thus inſtructed (according to Mr. Struchtmeyer) in the myſteries of Chriſtanity, taught theſe truths under the veil of *emblems*, *types*, and *figures*. Jupiter, repreſented the *true* God; Juno, who was obſtinate and ungovernable, was the emblem of the *ancient* Israel; the chaſte Diana, was a type of the *Chriſtian church*; Hercules, was the figure or fore-runner of Christ; Amphitryon, was Joseph; the two *Serpents*, that Hercules killed in his cradle, were the Phariſees and Saducees, &c. Such are the principal lines of Mr. Struchtmeyer's ſyſtem, which ſhews the ſad havock that a warm imagination, undirected by a juſt and ſolid judgment, makes in religion. It is, however, honourable perhaps to the preſent age, that a ſyſtem, from which Ammianus Marcellinus and other philoſophers of old derived applauſe, will be generally looked upon, at preſent, as intitling its reſtorer to a place in *Bedlam*.]

Progreſs of Chriſtianity.

XIX. The zeal and diligence with which Constantine and his ſucceſſors exerted themſelves in the cauſe of Chriſtianity, and in extending the limits of the church, prevent our ſurprize at the number of barbarous and uncivilized nations, which received the goſpel [n]. It appears highly probable, from many circumſtances, that both the *Greater* and the *Leſſer Armenia* were enlightened with the knowledge of the truth not long after the firſt riſe of Chriſtianity. The Armenian church was not, however, completely formed and eſtabliſhed before this century; in the commencement of which, Gregory, the ſon of Anax, who is commonly called the *Enlightner*, from his having diſpelled the darkneſs of the Armenian ſuperſtitions, converted to Chriſtianity Tiridates, king of *Armenia*, and all the nobles of his court. In conſequence of this, Gregory was conſecrated biſhop of the Armenians by Leontius biſhop of *Cappadocia*, and his miniſtry was crowned with ſuch ſucceſs, that the whole province was ſoon converted to the Chriſtian faith [o].

Among the Abaſſines or Ethiopians.

XX. Towards the middle of this century, a certain perſon named Frumentius, came from *Egypt* to *Abaſſia*, or *Æthiopia*, whoſe inhabitants derived the name of Axumitæ from Axuma, the capital city of that country. He made known among this people the goſpel of Christ, and adminiſtred the ſacrament of baptiſm to their king, and to ſeveral perſons of the firſt diſtinction at his court. As Frumentius was returning from hence into *Egypt*, he received conſecration, as the firſt biſhop of the Axumitæ, or Ethiopians from Athanasius. And this is the reaſon why the Ethiopian church, has, even to our times, been conſidered as the daughter of the Alexandrian, from which it alſo receives its biſhop [p].

And Georgians.

The light of the goſpel was introduced into *Iberia*, a province of *Aſia*, now called *Georgia*, in the following manner: A certain woman was carried into that country as a captive, during the reign of Constantine the Great, and by the grandeur of her miracles, and the remarkable ſanctity of her life and manners, ſhe made ſuch an impreſſion upon the king and queen, that they abandoned their falſe gods, embraced the faith of the goſpel, and ſent to

---

[n] Gaudentii *vita Philaſtrii*, § 3. Philastrius, *De hæreſ. Præf.* p. 5. edit. Fabricii. Socrates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. xix. Georgius Cedrenus *Chronograph.* p. 234. edit. Pariſ.

[o] *Narratio de rebus Armeniæ in* Franc. Combefisii *Auctario Biblioth. Patrum Græcor.* tom. ii. p. 287. Mich. Lequien *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 419. 1356. Jo. Joach. Schroderi *Theſaur. linguæ Armenicæ*, p. 149.

[p] Athanasius *Apolog. ad Conſtantium*, tom. i. Opp. par. II. p. 315. edit. Benedict. Socrates et Sozomen. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* book i. ch. xix. of the former, book ii. ch. xxiv. of the latter. Theodoret. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. xxiii. p. 54. Ludolf. *Comment. ad Hiſt. Æthiopic.* p. 281. Hier. Lobo *Voyage d'Abyſſinie*, tom. ii. p. 13. Justus Fontaninus, *Hiſt. Litter. Aquileiæ*, p. 174.

Conſtantinople, for proper perſons to give them and their people a more ſatisfactory and complete knowledge of the Chriſtian religion [q].

And Goths.

XXI. A conſiderable part of the Goths, who had inhabited *Thrace*, *Mœſia*, and *Dacia*, had received the knowledge, and embraced the doctrines of Chriſtianity before this century; and Theophilus, their biſhop, was preſent at the council of *Nice*. Constantine the Great, after having vanquiſhed them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Chriſtians [r]. But ſtill a large body continued in their attachment to their ancient ſuperſtition, until the time of the emperor Valens. This prince permitted them, indeed, to paſs the *Danube*, and to inhabit *Dacia*, *Mœſia*, and *Thrace*; but it was on condition, that they ſhould live in ſubjection to the Roman laws, and embrace the profeſſion of Chriſtianity [s], which condition was accepted by their king Fritigern. The celebrated Ulphilas, biſhop of thoſe Goths, who dwelt in *Mœſia*, lived in this century, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf much by his genius and piety. Among other eminent ſervices which he rendered to his country, he invented a ſet of letters for their peculiar uſe, and tranſlated the ſcriptures into the Gothic language [t].

Among the Gauls.

XXII. There remained ſtill, in the European provinces, an incredible number of perſons who adhered to the worſhip of the gods; and though the Chriſtian biſhops continued their pious efforts to gain them over to the goſpel, yet the ſucceſs was, by no means, proportionable to their diligence and zeal, and the work of converſion went on but ſlowly. In *Gaul*, the great and venerable Martin, biſhop of *Tours*, ſet about this important work with tolerable ſucceſs. For, in his various voyages among the Gauls, he converted many every where by the energy of his diſcourſes and by the power of his miracles, if we may rely upon the teſtimony of Sulpitius Severus in this matter. He deſtroyed alſo the temples of the gods, pulled down their ſtatues [u], and on all theſe accounts merited the high and honourable title of Apoſtle of the Gauls.

The cauſes of ſo many changes.

XXIII. There is no doubt, but that the victories of Constantine the Great, the fear of puniſhment, and the deſire of pleaſing this mighty conqueror and his imperial ſucceſſors, were the weighty arguments that moved whole nations, as well as particular perſons to embrace Chriſtianity. None, however, that have any acquaintance with the tranſactions of this period of time, will attribute the whole progreſs of Chriſtianity to theſe cauſes. For it is undeniably manifeſt, that the indefatigable zeal of the biſhops, and other pious men, the innocence and ſanctity which ſhone forth with ſuch luſtre in the lives of many Chriſtians, the tranſlations that were publiſhed of the ſacred writings, and the intrinſic beauty and excellence of the Chriſtian religion, made as ſtrong and deep impreſſions upon ſome, as worldly views and ſelfiſh conſiderations did upon others.

---

[q] Rufinus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. x. Sozomen. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. v. Lequien, *Oriens Chriſ.* tom. i. p. 1333.

[r] Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. xviii.

[s] Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. xxxiii. Lequien, *Oriens Chriſ.* tom. i. p. 1240. Eric. Benzelius, *Præf. ad Quatuor Evangelia Gothica, quæ* Ulphilæ *tribuuntur*, cap. v. p. xviii. publiſhed, at *Oxford*, in the year 1750, in 4to.

[t] Jo. Jac. Mascovii *Hiſtoria Germanorum*, tom. i. p. 317. tom. ii. *not.* p. 49. *Acta SS. Martii*, tom. iii. p. 619. Benzelius, *loc. citat.* cap. viii. p. xxx.

[u] See Sulpit. Severus, *Dial.* i. *De vita Martini*, cap. xiii. p. 20. cap. xv. p. 22. cap. xvii. p. 23. *Dial.* ii. p. 106. edit. Hier. a Prato, Verona, 1741.

As to the miracles attributed to ANTONY, PAUL the Hermit, and MARTIN, I give them up without the leaſt difficulty, and join with thoſe who treat theſe pretended prodigies with the contempt they deſerve [*w*]. I am alſo willing to grant, that many events have been raſhly eſteemed miraculous, which were the reſult of the ordinary laws of nature; and alſo that ſeveral pious frauds have been imprudently made uſe of, to give new degrees of weight and dignity to the Chriſtian cauſe. But I cannot, on the other hand, aſſent to the opinions of thoſe who maintain, that, in this century, miracles had entirely ceaſed; and that, at this period, the Chriſtian church was not favoured with any extraordinary or ſupernatural mark of a divine power engaged in its cauſe [*x*].

Perſecutions in *Perſia*.

XXIV. The Chriſtians, who lived under the Roman government, were not afflicted with any ſevere calamities from the time of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, except thoſe which they ſuffered during the troubles and commotions raiſed by LICINIUS, and under the tranſitory reign of JULIAN. Their tranquillity however was, at different times, diſturbed in ſeveral places. Among others ATHANARIC, king of the Goths, perſecuted, for ſome time with bitterneſs, that part of the Gothic nation which had embraced Chriſtianity [*y*]. In the remoter provinces, the Pagans often defended their ancient ſuperſtitions by the force of arms, and maſſacred the Chriſtians, who, in the propagation of their religion, were not always ſufficiently attentive, either to the rules of prudence, or the dictates of humanity [*z*]. The Chriſtians, who lived beyond the limits of the Roman empire, had a harder fate. SAPOR II, king of *Perſia*, vented his rage againſt thoſe of his dominions in three dreadful perſecutions. The firſt of theſe happened in the 18th year of the reign of that prince, the ſecond in the 30th, and the third in the 31ſt of the ſame reign. This laſt was the moſt cruel and deſtructive of the three; it carried off an incredible number of Chriſtians, and continued during the ſpace of forty years, having commenced in the year 330, and ceaſed only in 370. It was not, however, the religion of the Chriſtians, but the ill-grounded ſuſpicion of their treaſonable deſigns againſt the ſtate, that drew upon them this terrible calamity. For the Magi and the Jews perſuaded the Perſian monarch, that all the Chriſtians were devoted to the intereſts of the Roman emperor, and that SYMEON, archbiſhop of *Seleucia* and *Cteſiphon*, ſent to *Conſtantinople*, intelligence of all that paſſed in *Perſia* [*a*].

[*w*] HIER. a PRATO, in his Preface to SULPITIUS SEVERUS (p. xiii) diſputes warmly in favour of the miracles of MARTIN, and alſo of the other prodigies of this century.

[*x*] See EUSEBIUS's book againſt HIEROCLES, ch. iv. p. 431. edit. Olearii; as alſo HENR. DODWELL, *Diſſ.* ii. *in Irenæum*, § 55. p. 195.

[*y*] See THEODOR. *Ruinarti acta martyr. ſincera*, and there *Acta S. Sabæ*, p. 598.

[*z*] See AMBROSIUS, *De officiis*, lib. i. cap. xlii. § 17.

[*a*] See SOZOMEN. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. i. xiii. There is a particular and expreſs account of this perſecution in the *Bibliothec. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 6. 16. 181. tom. iii. p. 52. with which it will be proper to compare the Preface of the learned ASSEMAN, to his *Acta martyrum oriental. et occidental.* publiſhed, in two volumes in folio, at *Rome* in the year 1748; as this author has publiſhed the *Perſian Martyrology* in Syriac, with a Latin tranſlation, and enriched this valuable work with many excellent obſervations.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Which contains the hiſtory of learning and philoſophy.

The ſtate of learning.

I. PHILOLOGY, eloquence, poetry, and hiſtory were the branches of ſcience particularly cultivated, at this time, by thoſe, among the Greeks and Latins, who were deſirous to make a figure in the learned world. But thoſe ſeveral perſons of both nations acquired a certain degree of reputation by their literary purſuits, yet they came all far ſhort of the ſummit of fame. The beſt poets of this period, ſuch as AUSONIUS, appear inſipid, harſh, and inelegant when compared with the ſublime bards of the Auguſtan age. The rhetoricians, departing now from the noble ſimplicity and majeſty of the ancients, inſtructed the youth in the fallacious art of pompous declamation; and the greateſt part of the hiſtorical writers were more ſet upon embelliſhing their narrations with vain and tawdry ornaments, than upon rendering them intereſting by their order, perſpicuity, and truth.

The progreſs of the Platonic philoſophy.

II. Almoſt all the philoſophers of this age were of that ſect, which we have already diſtinguiſhed by the title of Modern Platonics. It is not therefore ſurprizing, that we find the principles of platoniſm in all the writings of the Chriſtians. The number, however, of theſe philoſophers was not ſo conſiderable in the weſt as in the eaſtern countries. JAMBLICHUS of *Chalcis* explained, in *Syria*, the philoſophy of PLATO, or rather propagated his own particular opinions under that reſpectable name. He was an obſcure and credulous man, and his turn of mind was highly ſuperſtitious and chimerical, as his writings abundantly teſtify [*b*]. His ſucceſſors were ÆDESIUS, MAXIMUS, and others, whoſe follies and puerilities are expoſed, at length, by EUNAPIUS. HYPATIA, a female philoſopher of diſtinguiſhed merit and learning, ISIDORUS, OLYMPIODORUS, SYNESIUS, afterwards a Semi-chriſtian, with others of inferior reputation, were the principal perſons concerned in propagating this new modification of platoniſm.

Its fate.

III. As the emperor JULIAN was paſſionately attached to this ſect (which his writings abundantly prove) he employed every method to increaſe its authority and luſtre, and, for that purpoſe, engaged in its cauſe ſeveral men of learning and genius, who vied with each other in exalting its merit and excellence [*c*]. But after his death, a dreadful ſtorm of perſecution aroſe,

---

[(*b*) Dr. MOSHEIM ſpeaks here of only one JAMBLICHUS, though there were three perſons who bore that name. It is not eaſy to determine which of them was the author of thoſe works that have reached our times under the name of JAMBLICHUS; but whoever it was, he does not certainly deſerve ſo mean a character as our learned hiſtorian here gives him.]

[*c*] See the learned Baron EZEKIEL SPANHEIM's *Preface to the works of Julian*; and that alſo which he has prefixed to his French tranſlation of JULIAN's *Cæſars*, p 111. and his Annotations to the latter, p. 234; ſee alſo BLETTERIE, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, lib. i. p. 26.

under the reign of VALENTINIAN, againſt the Platoniſts, many of whom being accuſed of magical practices, and other heinous crimes, were capitally convicted. During theſe commotions, MAXIMUS, the maſter and favourite of JULIAN, by whoſe perſuaſions this emperor had been engaged to renounce Chriſtianity, and to apply himſelf to the ſtudy of magic, was put to death with ſeveral others [*d*]. It is probable indeed, that the friendſhip and intimacy that had ſubſiſted between the apoſtate emperor and theſe pretended ſages were greater crimes in the eye of VALENTINIAN, than either their philoſophical ſyſtem or their magic arts. And hence it happened, that ſuch of the ſect, as lived at a diſtance from the court, were not involved in the dangers or calamities of this perſecution.

The ſtate of learning among the Chriſtians.

IV. From the time of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, the Chriſtians applied themſelves with more zeal and diligence to the ſtudy of philoſophy and of the liberal arts, than they had formerly done. The emperors encouraged this taſte for the ſciences, and left no means unemployed to excite and maintain a ſpirit of literary emulation among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity. For this purpoſe, ſchools were eſtabliſhed in many cities. Libraries were alſo erected, and men of learning and genius were nobly recompenſed by the honours and advantages that were attached to the culture of the ſciences and arts [*e*]. All this was indeſpenſably neceſſary to the ſucceſsful execution of the ſcheme that was laid for abrogating, by degrees, the worſhip of the gods. For the ancient religion was maintained, and its credit ſupported by the erudition and talents, which diſtinguiſhed in ſo many places the ſages of paganiſm. And there was juſt reaſon to apprehend that the truth might ſuffer, if the Chriſtian youth, for want of proper maſters and inſtructors of their own religion, ſhould have recourſe, for their education, to the ſchools of the Pagan philoſophers and rhetoricians.

Many illiterate Chriſtians.

V. From what has been here ſaid concerning the ſtate of learning among the Chriſtians, we would not have any conclude, that an acquaintance with the ſciences was become univerſal in the church of CHRIST. For, as yet, there was no law enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from eccleſiaſtical preferments and offices, and it is certain, that the greateſt part, both of the biſhops and preſbyters, were men entirely deſtitute of all learning and education. Beſides, that ſavage and illiterate party, who looked upon all ſorts of erudition, particularly that of a philoſophical kind, as pernicious and even deſtructive to true piety and religion, increaſed both in number and authority. The aſcetics, monks, and hermits augmented the ſtrength of this barbarous faction; and not only the women, but alſo all who took ſolemn looks, ſordid garments, and a love of ſolitude for real piety (and in this number we comprehend the generality of mankind) were vehemently prepoſſeſſed in their favour.

[*d*] AMMIAN. MARCELLIN. *Hiſtoriarum*, lib. xxix. cap. i. p. 556. edit. Valeſii. BLETTERIE, *Vie de Julien*, p. 30—155. 159. and *Vie de Jovien*, tom. i. 194.

[*e*] See GODOFRED. *ad Codicis Theodoſ. titulos de profeſſoribus et artibus liberalibus.* FRANC. BALDUINUS *in Conſtantino M.* p. 122. HERM. CONRINGII *Diſſert. de ſtudiis Romæ et Conſtantinop.* at the end of his *Antiquitates Academicæ*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the government of the church, and the Chriſtian doctors, during this century.

CENT. IV.

The form of government in the Chriſtian church.

I. CONSTANTINE the GREAT, made no eſſential alterations in the form of government that took place in the Chriſtian church before his time; he only corrected it in ſome particulars, and gave it a greater extent. For, though he permitted the church to remain a body-politic diſtinct from that of the ſtate, as it had formerly been, yet he aſſumed to himſelf the ſupreme power over this ſacred body, and the right of modelling and governing it in ſuch a manner, as ſhould be moſt conducive to the public good. This right he enjoyed without any oppoſition, as none of the biſhops preſumed to call his authority in queſtion. The people therefore continued, as uſual, to chuſe freely their biſhops and their teachers. The biſhop governed the church, and managed the eccleſiaſtical affairs of the city or diſtrict, where he preſided, in council with the preſbyters, and with a due regard to the ſuffrages of the whole aſſembly of the people. The provincial biſhops, aſſembled in council, deliberated together concerning thoſe matters that related to the intereſts of the churches of a whole province, as alſo concerning religious controverſies, the forms and rites of divine ſervice, and other things of like moment. To theſe leſſer councils, which were compoſed of the eccleſiaſtical deputies of one or more provinces, were afterwards added *œcumenical councils*, conſiſting of commiſſioners from all the churches in the Chriſtian world, and which, conſequently, repreſented the church univerſal. Theſe were eſtabliſhed by the authority of the emperor, who aſſembled the firſt of theſe univerſal councils at *Nice*. This prince thought it equitable, that queſtions of ſuperior importance, and ſuch as intimately concerned the intereſts of Chriſtianity in general, ſhould be examined, and decided in aſſemblies that repreſented the whole body of the Chriſtian church; and in this it is highly probable, that his judgment was directed by that of the biſhops. There were never, indeed, any councils held, which could, with ſtrict propriety, be called *univerſal*; thoſe however, whoſe laws and decrees were approved and admitted by the univerſal church, or the greateſt part of that ſacred body, are commonly called *œcumenical* or *general* councils.

Changes introduced with reſpect to the rights of the ſeveral orders of the church.

II. The rights and privileges of the ſeveral eccleſiaſtical orders were, however, gradually changed, and diminiſhed from the time that the church began to be torn with diviſions, and agitated with thoſe violent diſſenſions and tumults, to which the elections of biſhops, the diverſity of religious opinions, and other things of a like nature too frequently gave riſe. In theſe religious quarrels, the weaker generally fled to the court for protection and ſuccour; and thereby furniſhed the emperors with a favourable opportunity of ſetting limits to the power of the biſhops, of infringing the liberties of the people, and of modifying, in various ways, the ancient cuſtoms according to their pleaſure. And, indeed, even the biſhops themſelves, whoſe opulence and authority were conſiderably increaſed ſince the reign of CONSTANTINE, began to introduce, gradually, innovations into the forms of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, and to change the ancient government of the church. Their firſt ſtep was an entire excluſion of the people from all part in the adminiſtration of eccleſiaſtical affairs; and afterwards they, by degrees, diveſted even the *preſbyters* of their ancient privileges and their primitive authority, that they might have no importunate proteſters to controul their ambition, or oppoſe their proceedings; and, principally, that they might either engroſs to themſelves or diſtribute, as they thought proper, the poſſeſſions and revenues of the church. Hence it came to paſs, that, at the concluſion of this century, there remained no more than a mere ſhadow of the ancient government of the church. Many of the privileges, which had formerly belonged to the preſbyters and people, were uſurped by the biſhops; and many of the rights, which had been formerly veſted in the univerſal church, were transferred to the emperors, and to ſubordinate officers and magiſtrates.

The Eccleſiaſtical government modelled according to the civil.

III. CONSTANTINE the GREAT, in order to prevent civil commotions, and to fix his authority upon ſolid and ſtable foundations, made ſeveral changes, not only in the laws of the empire, but alſo in the form of the Roman government [*f*]. And as there were many important reaſons, which induced him to ſuit the adminiſtration of the church to theſe changes in the civil conſtitution, this neceſſarily introduced, among the biſhops, new degrees of eminence and rank. Three prelates had, before this, enjoyed a certain degree of pre-eminence over the reſt of the epiſcopal order, *viz.* The biſhops of *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*; and to theſe the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was added, when the imperial reſidence was transferred to that city. Theſe four prelates anſwered to the four *prætorian prefects* created by CONSTANTINE; and it is poſſible, that, in this very century, they were diſtinguiſhed by the Jewiſh title of Patriarchs. After theſe, followed the *exarchs*, who had the inſpection over ſeveral provinces, and anſwered to the appointment of certain civil officers who bore the ſame title. In a lower claſs, were the Metropolitans, who had only the government of one province, under whom were the *arch-biſhops*, whoſe inſpection was confined to certain diſtricts. In this gradation, the *biſhops* brought up the rear; the ſphere of their authority was not, in all places, equally extenſive; being in ſome conſiderably ample, and in others confined within narrow limits. To theſe various eccleſiaſtical orders, we might add that of the *chorepiſcopi*, or ſuperintendents of the country churches; but this order was, in moſt places, ſuppreſſed by the biſhops, with a deſign to extend their own authority, and enlarge the ſphere of their power and juriſdiction [*g*].

Patriarchs.
Exarchs.

Arch-biſhops.

The adminiſtration of the church divided into external and internal.

IV. The adminiſtration of the church was divided, by CONSTANTINE himſelf, into an *external* and an *internal* inſpection [*h*]. The latter, which was committed to biſhops and councils, related to *religious controverſies*; the *forms*

[*f*] See BOS, *Hiſtoire de la Monarchie Françoiſe*, tom. i. p. 64. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 94. 152.

[*g*] This appears from ſeveral paſſages in the uſeful work of LUD. THOMASSINUS, intitled, *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ vet. et nova circa beneficia*, tom. i.

[*h*] EUSEB. *De vita Conſtantini*, lib. iv. cap. xxiv. p. 536.

of divine worſhip; *the offices of the prieſts*; the *vices of the eccleſiaſtical orders*, &c. The *external* adminiſtration of the church, the emperor aſſumed to himſelf. This comprehended all thoſe things that relate to the *outward ſtate* and *diſcipline* of the church; it likewiſe extended to all *conteſts* and *debates* that ſhould ariſe between the miniſters of the church ſuperior, as well as inferior, concerning their *poſſeſſions*, their *reputation*, their *rights* and *privileges*, their offences againſt the laws and things of a like nature [*i*]; but no controverſies that related to matters purely religious were cognizable by this *external* inſpection. In conſequence of this artful diviſion of the eccleſiaſtical government, CONSTANTINE and his ſucceſſors called councils, preſided in them, appointed the judges of religious controverſies, terminated the differences which aroſe between the biſhops and the people, fixed the limits of the eccleſiaſtical provinces, took cognizance of the civil cauſes that ſubſiſted between the miniſters of the church, and puniſhed the crimes committed againſt the laws by the ordinary judges appointed for that purpoſe; giving over all cauſes purely eccleſiaſtical to the cognizance of biſhops and councils. But this famous diviſion of the adminiſtration of the church was never explained with perſpicuity, nor determined with a ſufficient degree of accuracy and preciſion; ſo that both in this, and the following centuries, we find many tranſactions that ſeem abſolutely inconſiſtent with it. We find the emperors, for example, frequently determining matters purely eccleſiaſtical, and that belonged to the *internal* juriſdiction of the church: and on the other hand, nothing is more frequent than the deciſions of biſhops and councils concerning things that relate merely to the *external* form and government of the church.

The rank and dignity of the biſhop of *Rome*.

V. In the epiſcopal order, the biſhop of *Rome* was the firſt in rank, and was diſtinguiſhed by a ſort of pre-eminence over all other prelates. Prejudices, ariſing from a great variety of cauſes, contributed to eſtabliſh this ſuperiority; but it was chiefly owing to certain circumſtances of grandeur and opulence, by which mortals, for the moſt part, form their ideas of pre-eminence and dignity, and which they generally confound with the reaſons of a juſt and legal authority. The biſhop of *Rome* ſurpaſſed all his brethren in the magnificence and ſplendor of the church over which he preſided; in the riches of his revenues and poſſeſſions; in the number and variety of his miniſters; in his credit with the people; and in his ſumptuous and ſplendid manner of living [*k*]. Theſe dazzling marks of human power, theſe ambiguous proofs of true greatneſs and felicity, had ſuch a mighty influence upon the minds of the multitude, that the ſee of *Rome* became, in this century, a moſt ſeducing object of ſacerdotal ambition. Hence it happened, that when a new pontif was to be elected by the ſuffrages of the preſbyters and the people, the city of *Rome* was generally agitated with diſſenſions, tumults, and cabals, whoſe conſequences were often deplorable and fatal. The intrigues and diſturbances, that prevailed in that city in the year 366, when, upon the death of LIBERIUS, another pontif was to be choſen in his place, are a ſufficient proof of what we have now advanced. Upon this occaſion, one faction elected DAMASUS to that high dignity, while the oppoſite party choſe URSICINUS, a deacon of the vacant church, to ſucceed LIBERIUS. This double election gave riſe to a dangerous ſchiſm, and to a ſort of civil war within the city of *Rome*, which was carried on with the utmoſt barbarity and fury, and produced the moſt cruel maſſacres and deſolations. This inhuman conteſt ended in the victory of DAMASUS; but whether his cauſe was more juſt than that of URSICINUS, is a queſtion not ſo eaſy to determine [*l*]. Neither of the two, indeed, ſeem to have been poſſeſſed of ſuch principles as conſtitute a good Chriſtian, much leſs of that exemplary virtue, that ſhould diſtinguiſh a Chriſtian biſhop.

[*i*] See the imperial laws both in JUSTINIAN's *Code*, and in the THEODOSIAN; as alſo GODOFRED. *ad Codic. Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 55. 58. 333, &c.

[*k*] AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS gives a ſtriking deſcription of the luxury in which the biſhops of *Rome* lived, *Hiſt.* lib. xxvii. cap. iii. p. 337.

The limits of his authority.

VI. Notwithſtanding the pomp and ſplendor that ſurrounded the Roman ſee, it is, however, certain, that the biſhops of that city had not acquired, in this century, that pre-eminence of power and juriſdiction in the church which they afterwards enjoyed. In the eccleſiaſtical commonwealth, they were, indeed, the moſt eminent order of citizens; but ſtill they were citizens as well as their brethren, and ſubject, like them, to the edicts and laws of the emperors. All religious cauſes of extraordinary importance were examined and determined, either by judges appointed by the emperors, or in councils aſſembled for that purpuſe, while thoſe of inferior moment were decided, in each diſtrict, by its reſpective biſhop. The eccleſiaſtical laws were enacted either by the emperor or by councils. None of the biſhops acknowledged, that they derived their authority from the permiſſion and appointment of the biſhop of *Rome*, or that they were created biſhops by the *favour of the apoſtolic ſee*. On the contrary, they all maintained, that they were the ambaſſadors and miniſters of JESUS CHRIST, and that their authority was derived from above [*m*]. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that, even in this century, ſeveral of thoſe ſteps were laid, by which the biſhops of *Rome* mounted afterwards to the ſummit of eccleſiaſtical power and deſpotiſm. Theſe ſteps were partly laid by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the dexterity of the Roman prelates themſelves, and partly by the inconſiderate zeal and precipitate judgment of certain biſhops [*n*]. The fourth *canon* of the council, held at *Sardis* in the year 347, is conſidered, by the votaries of the Roman pontif, as

---

[*l*] Among the other writers of the papal hiſtory, ſee BOWER's *Hiſtory of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 180, 181, 182.

[*m*] Thoſe who deſire an ampler account of this matter, may conſult PETR. de MARCA, *De concordia Sacerdotii et imperii*. DU PIN, *De antiqua eccleſiæ diſciplina*; and the very learned and judicious work of BLONDEL, *De la Primauté dans l'Egliſe*.

[(*n*) The imprudence of the emperor, and the precipitation of the biſhops, were ſingularly diſcovered in the following event, which favoured extremely the riſe and the ambition of the Roman pontif: About the year 372, VALENTINIAN enacted a law, impowering the biſhop of *Rome* to examine and judge other biſhops, that religious diſputes might not be decided by profane or ſecular judges. The biſhops aſſembled in council, at *Rome*, in 378, not conſidering the fatal conſequences that muſt ariſe, from this imprudent law, both to themſelves and to the church, declared their approbation of it in the ſtrongeſt terms, and recommended the execution of it in an addreſs to the emperor GRATIAN.—Some think, indeed, that this law impowered the Roman biſhop to judge only the biſhops within the limits of his juriſdiction, *i. e.* thoſe of the ſuburbicarian provinces. Others are of opinion, that this power was given only for a time, and extended to thoſe biſhops alone, who were concerned in the preſent ſchiſm. This laſt notion the principal ſtep to his ſovereignty in the church; but, in my opinion, it ought, by no means, to be looked upon in this point of view. For, not to inſiſt upon the reaſons that prove the authority of this council to be extremely dubious, nor upon thoſe which have induced ſome to regard its laws as groſly corrupted, and others, to conſider them as entirely fictitious and ſpurious [o], it will be ſufficient to obſerve the impoſſibility of proving by the *canon* in queſtion, that the biſhops of *Sardis* were of opinion, that, in all caſes, an appeal might be made to the biſhop of *Rome*, in quality of ſupreme judge [p]. But ſuppoſing, for a moment, that this was their opinion, what would follow? Surely, that pretext for aſſuming a ſupreme authority muſt be very ſlender, which ariſes only from the decree of one obſcure council.

The authority of the biſhop of Conſtantinople is increaſed.

VII. CONSTANTINE the GREAT, by removing the ſeat of the empire to *Byzantium*, and building the city of *Conſtantinople*, raiſed up, in the biſhop of this new metropolis, a formidable rival to the Roman pontif, and a bulwark which menaced a vigorous oppoſition to his growing authority. For, as the emperor, in order to render *Conſtantinople* a ſecond *Rome*, enriched it with all the rights and privileges, honours and ornaments of the ancient capital of the world; ſo its biſhop, meaſuring his own dignity and rank by the magnificence of the new city, and its eminence, as the auguſt reſidence of the emperor, aſſumed an equal degree of dignity with the biſhop of *Rome*, and claimed a ſuperiority over all the reſt of the epiſcopal order. Nor did the emperors diſapprove of theſe high pretenſions, ſince they conſidered their own dignity as connected, in a certain meaſure, with that of the biſhop of their imperial city. Accordingly, in a council held at *Conſtantinople*, in the year 381, by the authority of THEODOSIUS the GREAT, the biſhop of that city was, during the abſence of the biſhop of *Alexandria*, and againſt the conſent of the Roman prelate, placed, by the third *canon* of that council, in the firſt rank after the biſhop of *Rome*, and, conſequently, above thoſe of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. NECTARIUS was the firſt biſhop, who enjoyed theſe new honours accumulated upon the ſee of *Conſtantinople*. His ſucceſſor, the celebrated JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, extended ſtill further the privileges of that ſee, and ſubmitted to its juriſdiction all *Thrace*, *Aſia*, and *Pontus* [q]; nor were the ſucceeding biſhops of that imperial city deſtitute of a fervent zeal to augment their privileges, and to extend their dominion.

ſeems probable; but ſtill this privilege was an excellent inſtrument in the hands of ſacerdotal ambition.]

[o] See MICH. GEDDES *Diſſ. de canonibus Sardicenſibus*, which is to be found in his *Miſcellaneous tracts*, tom. ii. p. 415.

[(p) The fourth canon of the council of *Sardis*, ſuppoſing it genuine and authentic, related only to the particular caſe of a biſhop's being depoſed by the neighbouring prelates, and demanding a permiſſion to make his defence. In that caſe, this canon prohibited the election of a ſucceſſor to the depoſed biſhop, before that the biſhop of *Rome* had examined the cauſe, and pronounced ſentence thereupon.]

[q] See PETR. de MARCA, *Diſſ. de Conſtantinop. Patriarchatus inſtitutione*, which is ſubjoined to his book, *De concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*. MICH. LEQUIEN *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 15. See alſo *An account of the government of the Chriſtian church for the firſt ſix hundred years*, by Dr. PARKER, biſhop of *Oxford*, p. 245.

This ſudden revolution in the eccleſiaſtical government, and this unexpected promotion of the biſhop of *Byzantium* to a higher rank, to the detriment of other prelates of the firſt eminence in the church, were productive of the moſt diſagreeable effects. For this promotion not only filled the biſhops of *Alexandria* with the bittereſt averſion to thoſe of *Conſtantinople*, but alſo excited thoſe deplorable contentions and diſputes between theſe latter and the Roman pontifs, which were carried on, for many ages, with ſuch various ſucceſs, and concluded, at length, in the entire ſeparation of the Latin and Greek churches.

The vices of the clergy.

VIII. The additions made by the emperors and others to the wealth, honours, and advantages of the clergy, were followed with a proportionable augmentation of vices and luxury, particularly among thoſe of that ſacred order, who lived in great and opulent cities; and that many ſuch additions were made to that order after the time of CONSTANTINE, is a matter that admits of no diſpute. The *biſhops*, on the one hand, contended with each other, in the moſt ſcandalous manner, concerning the extent of their reſpective juriſdictions, while, on the other, they trampled upon the rights of the people, violated the privileges of the inferior miniſters, and imitated, in their conduct and in their manner of living, the arrogance, voluptuouſneſs, and luxury of magiſtrates and princes [r]. This pernicious example was ſoon followed by the ſeveral eccleſiaſtical orders. The *preſbyters*, in many places, aſſumed an equality with the biſhops in point of rank and authority. We find alſo many complaints made, at this time, of the vanity and effeminacy of the *deacons*. Thoſe more particularly of the preſbyters and deacons, who filled the firſt ſtations of theſe orders, carried their pretenſions to an extravagant length, and were offended at the notion of being placed upon an equal footing with their collegues. For this reaſon, they not only aſſumed the titles of *Archpreſbyters* and *Archdeacons*, but alſo claimed a degree of authority and power much ſuperior to that which was veſted in the other members of their reſpective orders.

The famous Greek writers.

IX. Several writers of great reputation lived in this century, and were ſhining ornaments to the countries to which they belonged. Among thoſe that flouriſhed in *Greece* and in the eaſtern provinces, the following ſeem to deſerve the firſt rank:

EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS, biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Paleſtine*, a man of immenſe reading, juſtly famous for his profound knowledge of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and ſingularly verſed in other branches of literature, more eſpecially, in all the different parts of ſacred erudition. Theſe eminent talents and acquiſitions were, however, accompanied with errors and defects, and he is ſaid to have inclined towards the ſentiments of thoſe, who look upon the three perſons in the god-head, as different from each other in rank and dignity.

---

[r] See SULPIT. SEVER. *Hiſt. Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xxiii, p. 74. lib. ii. cap. xxxii. p. 245. cap. li. p. 292. *Dialog.* i. cap. xxi. p. 426. Add to this the account given by CLARKSON, in his *Diſcourſe upon liturgies*, p. 228. of the corrupt and profligate manners of the clergy, and, particularly, of the unbounded ambition of the biſhops, to enlarge the ſphere of their influence and authority.

Some have repreſented this learned prelate as a thorough Arian, but without foundation; if by an Arian be meant, one who embraces the doctrines taught by ARIUS, preſbyter of *Alexandria* [s].

PETER of *Alexandria*, who is mentioned by EUSEBIUS with the higheſt encomiums [t].

ATHANASIUS, patriarch of *Alexandria*, celebrated on account of his learned and pious labours, and particularly famous for his warm and vigorous oppoſition to the Arians [u].

BASIL, ſurnamed the GREAT, biſhop of *Cæſarea*, who, in point of genius, controverſial ſkill, and a rich and flowing eloquence, was ſurpaſſed by very few in this century [w].

CYRIL, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who has left ſome catechetical diſcourſes which he delivered in that city: he has been accuſed by many of intimate connexions with the Semi-arians [x].

JOHN, ſurnamed CHRYSOSTOM, on account of his extraordinary eloquence, a man of a noble genius, governed ſucceſſively the churches of *Antioch* and *Conſtantinople* [y], and left behind him ſeveral monuments of his profound and extenſive erudition; as alſo diſcourſes which he had preached with vaſt applauſe, and which are yet extant [z].

EPIPHANIUS, biſhop of *Salamis*, in the iſle of *Cyprus*, who wrote a book againſt all the hereſies that had ſprung up in the church until his time; this work has little or no reputation, as it is full of inaccuracies and errors, and diſcovers almoſt in every page the levity and ignorance of its author [a].

GREGORY NAZIANZEN and GREGORY of *Nyſſa*, who have obtained a very honourable place among the celebrated theological and polemic writers of this century, and not without foundation, as their works ſufficiently teſtify [b]. Their reputation, indeed, would have been yet more confirmed, had they been leſs attached to the writings of Origen [c], and leſs infected with the falſe and vitious eloquence of the ſophiſts.

---

[s] No writer has accuſed EUSEBIUS of arianiſm, with more bitterneſs and erudition, than LE CLERC, in the ſecond of his *Epiſtolæ Eccleſ. et Criticæ*, which are ſubjoined to his *Ars Critica*, and NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Nov. T. Sæc.* iv. *Diſſ.* xvii. p. 205. All, however, that theſe writers prove is, that EUSEBIUS maintained that there was a certain diſparity and ſubordination between the perſons of the god-head. And ſuppoſe this to have been his opinion, it will not follow from thence that he was an Arian, unleſs that word be taken in a very extenſive and improper ſenſe. Nothing is more common than the abuſive application of this term to perſons, who have held opinions quite oppoſite to thoſe of ARIUS, though perhaps they may have erred in other reſpects.

[t] *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib ix. cap. vi.

[u] EUSEBIUS RENAUDOTUS, in his *Hiſtory of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, p. 83. has collected all the accounts which the Oriental writers give of ATHANASIUS, of whoſe works the learned and juſtly celebrated Benedictine, BERNARD MONTFAUCON has given a ſplendid edition in three volumes in folio.

[w] The works of BASIL were publiſhed, at *Paris*, in three volumes folio, by JULIEN GARNIER, a learned Benedictine.

[x] The later editions of the works of this prelate, are, thoſe publiſhed by Mr. MILLES and by AUGUSTUS TOUTTEE, a Benedictine monk.

[y] It muſt not be underſtood by this, that CHRYSOSTOM was biſhop of both theſe churches: he was *preacher* at *Antioch* (a function, indeed, which before him was always attached to the epiſcopal dignity) and afterwards patriarch of *Conſtantinople*.

[z] The beſt edition of the works of CHRYSOSTOM, is that publiſhed by MONTFAUCON, in eleven volumes, folio.

[a] The works of EPIPHANIUS have been tranſlated into Latin, and publiſhed, with notes, by the learned PETAU. His life written by GERVAS, appeared at *Paris* in 1738, in 4to.

Ephraim, the Syrian, who has acquired an immortal name by the ſanctity of his converſation and manners, and, by the multitude of thoſe excellent writings, in which he has combated the ſectaries, explained the ſacred writings, and unfolded the moral duties and obligations of Chriſtians [d].

Beſides the learned men now mentioned, there are ſeveral others, of whoſe writings but a ſmall number have ſurvived the ruins of time; ſuch as Pamphilus, a martyr, and an intimate friend of Eusebius; Diodorus, biſhop of *Tarſus*; Hosius of *Cordova*; Didymus of *Alexandria*; Eustathius, biſhop of *Antioch*; Amphilochius, biſhop of *Iconium*; Palladius, the writer of the *Lauſiac Hiſtory* [e]; Macarius the elder and the younger; Apollinarius the elder; and ſome others, who are frequently mentioned on account of their erudition, and the remarkable events in which they were concerned.

The principal Latin writers.

X. The Latins alſo were not without writers of conſiderable note, the principal of whom we ſhall point out here.

Hilary, biſhop of *Poictiers*, acquired a name by xii *books concerning the Trinity*, which he wrote againſt the Arians, and ſeveral other productions. He was a man of penetration and genius; notwithſtanding which, he has, for the moſt part, rather copied in his writings Tertullian and Origen, than given us the fruits of his own ſtudy and invention [f].

Lactantius [g], the moſt eloquent of the Latin writers in this century, expoſed the abſurdity of the Pagan ſuperſtitions in his *Divine Inſtitutions*, which are written with uncommon purity and elegance. He wrote alſo upon other ſubjects: but was much more ſucceſsful in refuting the errors of others, than careful in obſerving and correcting his own [h].

---

[b] There are ſome good editions of theſe two writers, which we owe to the care and induſtry of two learned French editors of the laſt century. [*Viz.* the Abbot Billy, who publiſhed the works of Gregory Nazianzen at *Paris*, in two volumes, folio, in the year 1609, with a Latin tranſlation and learned notes; and Father Fronton du Duc, who publiſhed thoſe of Gregory of *Nyſſa*, in 1605]

[(c) The charge of *Origeniſm* ſeems to have been brought by the ancient writers only againſt Gregory of *Nyſſa*.]

[d] There is a large and accurate account of this excellent writer, in the *Biblioth. Oriental, Vaticanæ* of Joseph Simon Asseman, tom. i. p. 24. Several works of Ephraim have been publiſhed, in Greek, at *Oxford*, of which Gerard Vossius has given a Latin edition. An edition, in Syriac, of the ſame works was publiſhed at *Rome*, not long ago, by Steph. Evod. Asseman.

[(e) This is the hiſtory of the *ſolitaries*, or *hermits*, which derived the name of *Lauſiac* hiſtory from Lausus, governor of *Cappadocia*, at whoſe requeſt it was compoſed, and to whom it was dedicated by Palladius.]

[f] There is a very accurate and ample account of Hilary, in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i. Siecle iv. p. 139—193. The beſt edition we have of his works is that publiſhed by the French Benedictines.

[g] See a complete account of Lactantius, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i. Siecle iv. p. 65.

[(h) Lactantius conſiders Christ's miſſion as having no other end, than that of leading mankind to virtue by the moſt ſublime precepts and the moſt perfect example. The charge of Manicheiſm brought againſt this eminent writer, is refuted in the moſt evident and ſatisfactory

AMBROSE, prefect, and afterwards biſhop of *Milan*, was not deſtitute of a certain degree of elegance both of genius and ſtyle; his ſentiments of things were, by no means, abſurd; but he did not eſcape the prevailing defect of that age, a want of ſolidity, accuracy, and order [i].

JEROME, a monk of *Paleſtine*, rendered, by his learned and zealous labours, ſuch eminent ſervices to the Chriſtian cauſe, as will hand down his name, with honour, to the lateſt poſterity. But this ſuperior and illuſtrious merit was accompanied, and, in ſome meaſure, obſcured by very great defects. His complexion was exceſſively warm and choleric; his bitterneſs againſt thoſe who differed from him, extremely keen; and his thirſt of glory inſatiable. He was ſo prone to cenſure, that ſeveral perſons, whoſe lives were not only irreproachable, but even exemplary, became the objects of his unjuſt accuſations. All this, joined to his ſuperſtitious turn of mind, and the enthuſiaſtic encomiums, which he laviſhed upon a falſe and degenerate ſort of piety which prevailed in his time, ſunk his reputation greatly, and that even in the eſteem of the candid and the wiſe. His writings are voluminous, but not all equally adapted to inſtruct and edify. His interpretations of the holy ſcriptures and his *epiſtles*, are thoſe of his productions, which ſeem the moſt proper to be red with profit [k].

The fame of AUGUSTIN, biſhop of *Hippo*, in *Africa*, filled the whole Chriſtian world; and not without reaſon, as a variety of great and ſhining qualities were united in the character of that illuſtrious man. A ſublime genius, an uninterrupted and zealous purſuit of truth, an indefatigable application, an invincible patience, a ſincere piety, and a ſubtile and lively wit, conſpired to eſtabliſh his fame upon the moſt laſting foundations. It is however certain, that the accuracy and ſolidity of his judgment were, by no means, proportionable to the eminent talents now mentioned; and that, upon many occaſions, he was more guided by the violent impulſe of a warm imagination, than by the cool dictates of reaſon and prudence. Hence that ambiguity which appears in his writings, and which has ſometimes rendered the moſt attentive readers uncertain with reſpect to his real ſentiments; and hence alſo the juſt complaints which many have made of the contradictions that are ſo frequent in his works, and of the levity and precipitation, with which he ſet himſelf to write upon a variety of ſubjects, before he had examined them with a ſufficient degree of attention and diligence [l].

---

manner by Dr. LARDNER, in the ſeventh volume of his *Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory*, where the reader may find an ample and intereſting account of his character and his writings. Among thoſe who have been editors of the works of LACTANTIUS, the moſt reputed are BUNEMANN, HEUMANN, WALCHIUS, and LANGUET de FRESNOY.]

[i] The works of St. AMBROSE have been publiſhed, by the Benedictines, in two volumes in folio.

[k] The defects of JEROME are expoſed by LE CLERC, in his *Quæſtiones Hieronymianæ*, publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 12mo in the year 1700. The Benedictine monks have given an edition of the works of this father in five volumes, which was republiſhed, at *Verona*, by VALLARSIUS, with conſiderable additions.

[l] An accurate and ſplendid edition of the works of St. AUGUSTIN has been given by the Benedictins, ſince that of the divines of *Louvain*. This elegant edition bears the title of *Antwerp*, where it was publiſhed, with ſome augmentations, by LE CLERC, under the fictitious

OPTATUS, biſhop of *Milevi*, in *Numidia*, acquired no ſmall degree of reputation, by a work which he wrote in *ſix books* againſt the *Schiſm* of the *Donatiſts* [m].

PAULINUS, biſhop of *Nola*, left behind him ſome poems and epiſtles, which are ſtill extant; but are not remarkable either for their excellence or their meanneſs [n].

RUFINUS, preſbyter of *Aquileia*, is famous on account of his Latin tranſlations of ORIGEN and other Greek writters, his commentaries on ſeveral paſſages of the holy ſcriptures, and his bitter conteſt with JEROME. He would have obtained a very honourable place among the Latin writers of this century, had it not been his misfortune to have had the powerful and foul-mouthed JEROME for his adverſary [o].

As to PHILASTRIUS, DAMASUS, JUVENCUS, and other writers of that obſcure claſs, we refer the reader, for an account of them, to thoſe authors, whoſe principal deſign is to give an exact enumeration of the Chriſtian writers. We ſhall add, nevertheleſs, to the liſt already given, SULPITIUS SEVERUS, by birth a Gaul, and the moſt eminent hiſtorical writer of this century [p]; as alſo PRUDENTIUS a Spaniard, a poet of a happy and elegant genius.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The ſtate of religion.

I. THE fundamental principles of the Chriſtian doctrine were preſerved hitherto uncorrupted and entire in moſt churches, though it muſt be confeſſed that they were often explained and defended in a manner that diſcovered the greateſt ignorance and an utter confuſion of ideas. The diſputes carried on in the council of *Nice*, concerning the three perſons in the God-head, afford a remarkable example of this, particularly in the language and explanations of thoſe who approved of the deciſions of that council. So little light, preciſion, and order reigned in their diſcourſes, that they appeared to ſubſtitute three Gods in the place of one.

---

name of JO. PHEREPONUS. The Jeſuits, however, pretend to have found many defects in this edition.

[m] Since the edition of OPTATUS, publiſhed by ALBASPINÆUS, another has appeared, which we owe to the care and induſtry of DU PIN, doctor of the *Sorbonne*.

[n] The beſt edition of PAULINUS is that which was publiſhed at *Paris*, in the year 1685, by LE BRUN.

[(o) RUFINUS and JEROME had lived, for many years, in the moſt intimate and tender friendſhip, which ended in a violent rupture, on occaſion of a tranſlation which the former made of ſome of the works of ORIGEN, particularly his *book of principles*. For an account of RUFINUS, ſee RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſ. par* M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 124, &c. An ample account of the ſame writer is given by JUSTUS FONTANINUS, *Hiſt. Literar. Aquileienſis* lib. v. p. 149.]

[p] See *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 95; as alſo HIERON. a PRATO, who has written, with great accuracy, the life of this hiſtorian.

Nor did the evil end here; for thoſe vain fictions, which an attachment to the Platonic philoſophy, and to popular opinions, had engaged the greateſt part of the Chriſtian doctors to adopt, before the time of CONSTANTINE, were now confirmed, enlarged, and embelliſhed in various ways. From hence aroſe that extravagant veneration for departed ſaints, and thoſe abſurd notions of a certain *fire* deſtined to purify ſeparate ſouls, that now prevailed, and of which the public marks were every where to be ſeen. Hence alſo the celibacy of the prieſts, the worſhip of images and relicks, which, in proceſs of time, almoſt utterly deſtroyed the Chriſtian religion, or, at leaſt, eclipſed its luſtre, and corrupted its very eſſence in the moſt deplorable manner.

The increaſe of ſuperſtition.

II. An enormous train of different ſuperſtitions were gradually ſubſtituted in the place of true religion and genuine piety. This odious revolution was owing to a variety of cauſes. A ridiculous precipitation in receiving new opinions, a prepoſterous deſire of imitating the Pagan rites, and of blending them with the Chriſtian worſhip, and that idle propenſity which the generality of mankind have towards a gaudy and oſtentatious religion, all contributed to eſtabliſh the reign of ſuperſtition upon the ruins of Chriſtianity. Accordingly, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken, to *Paleſtine*, and to the tombs of the martyrs, as if there alone the ſacred principles of virtue, and the certain hope of ſalvation, were to be acquired [q]. The reins being once let looſe to ſuperſtition, which knows no bounds, abſurd notions and idle ceremonies multiplied every day. Quantities of duſt and earth brought from *Paleſtine*, and other places remarkable for their ſuppoſed ſanctity, were handed about as the moſt powerful remedies againſt the violence of wicked ſpirits, and were ſold and bought every where at enormous prices [r]. The public proceſſions and ſupplications, by which the Pagans endeavoured to appeaſe their gods, were now adopted into the Chriſtian worſhip, and celebrated with great pomp and magnificence in ſeveral places. The virtues that had formerly been aſcribed to the heathen temples, to their luſtrations, to the ſtatues of their gods and heros, were now attributed to Chriſtian churches, to water conſecrated by certain forms of prayer, and to the images of holy men. And the ſame privileges, that the former enjoyed under the darkneſs of paganiſm were conferred upon the latter under the light of the goſpel, or, rather, under that cloud of ſuperſtition that was obſcuring its glory. It is true, that, as yet, images were not very common; nor were there any ſtatues at all. But it is, at the ſame time, as undoubtedly certain, as it is extravagant and monſtruous, that the worſhip of the *martyrs* was modelled, by degrees, according to the religious ſervices that were paid to the gods before the coming of CHRIST [s].

From theſe facts, which are but ſmall ſpecimens of the ſtate of Chriſtianity at this time, the diſcerning reader will eaſily perceive what detriment the church received from the peace and proſperity procured by CONSTANTINE, and from the imprudent methods employed to allure the different nations to embrace the goſpel. The brevity we have propoſed to obſerve in this hiſtory, prevents our entering into an ample detail of the diſmal effects, which aroſe from the progreſs and the baneful influence of ſuperſtition, now become univerſal.

---

[q] See GREGOR. NYSSENI, *Orat. ad eos qui Hieroſolymam adeunt*, tom. iii. Opp. p. 568. HIERONYMUS, *Epiſt.* xiii. *ad Paulinum de inſtituto Monachi*, tom. i. p. 66. JAC. GODOFRED. *ad Codicem Theodoſian.* tom. vi. p. 65. PETRI WESSELINGII, *Diſſertat. de cauſis peregrinat. Hieroſolymit. quam Itinerario Burdigalenſi præmiſit*, inter *vetera Romanor. Itineraria*, p. 537.

[r] AUGUSTINUS, *De civitate Dei*, lib. xxii. cap. viii. § 6.

[s] For a full account of this matter, ſee BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſt. du Manicheiſm*, tom. ii. p. 642.

Hence pious frauds.

III. This, indeed, among other unhappy effects, opened a wide door to the endleſs frauds of thoſe odious impoſtors, who were ſo far deſtitute of all principle, as to enrich themſelves by the ignorance and errors of the people. Rumours were artfully ſpred abroad of prodigies and miracles to be ſeen in certain places (a trick often practiſed by the heathen prieſts) and the deſign of theſe reports was to draw the populace, in multitudes, to theſe places, and to impoſe upon their credulity. Theſe ſtratagems were generally ſucceſsful; for the ignorance and ſlowneſs of apprehenſion of the people, to whom every thing, that is new and ſingular, appears miraculous, rendered them eaſily the dupes of this abominable artifice [*t*]. Nor was this all: certain tombs were falſely given out for the ſepulchres of ſaints [*u*] and confeſſors; the liſt of the ſaints was augmented with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs [*w*]. Some buried the bones of dead men in certain retired places, and then affirmed, that they were divinely admoniſhed, by a dream, that the body of ſome friend of God lay there [*x*]. Many, eſpecially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces; and not only ſold, with the moſt frontleſs impudence, their fictitious relicks, but alſo deceived the eyes of the multitude with ludicrous combats with evil ſpirits or genii [*y*]. A whole volume would be requiſite to contain an enumeration of the various frauds, which artful knaves practiſed, with ſucceſs, to delude the ignorant, when true religion was almoſt entirely ſuperſeded by horrid ſuperſtition.

Verſions of the holy ſcriptures.

IV. Many of the learned, in this century, undertook tranſlations of the holy ſcriptures, but few ſucceeded in this arduous enterprize. Among the many Latin verſions of the ſacred books, that of JEROME was diſtinguiſhed by its undoubted ſuperiority [*z*]. The ſame ingenious and indefatigable writer, whoſe ſkill in the languages was, by no means, inconſiderable, employed much pains upon the Greek verſion of the ſeventy interpreters, in order to give a more correct edition of it, than had appeared before his time: and it is ſaid, that EUSEBIUS, ATHANASIUS, and EUTHALIUS had embarked in an undertaking of the ſame nature [*a*]. The number of interpreters was very conſiderable, among whom JEROME, HILARY, EUSEBIUS, DIODORUS of *Tarſus*, RUFINUS, EPHRAIM the Syrian, THEODORE of *Heraclea*, CHRYSOSTOM,

---

[*t*] HENRY DOGWELL. *Diſſert.* ii. *in Irenæum*, § 56. p. 196. LE CLERC, in his *Appendix Auguſtinian.* p. 492. 550. 575.

[*u*] *Concil. Carthag.* v. *Canon* xiv. tom. i. *Conciliorum*, p. 988. edit. Harduini.

[*w*] SULPITUS SEVERUS, *De vita S. Martini*, cap. viii.

[*x*] AUGUSTIN. *Sermone* cccxviii. § 1. tom. v. Opp. p. 886. edit. Antwerp.

[*y*] See GODOFRED. *ad cod. Theod.* tom. iii. p. 172. AUGUSTIN. *De opere Monachor.* cap. xxviii. § 36. p. 364. tom. vi. Opp. HIERONYM. *Epiſt. ad Ruſticum*, tom. i. Opp. p. 45.

[*z*] See JO. FRANC. BUDDEI *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1532.

[*a*] FRICKIUS, *De Canone N. T.* p. 18.

Athanasius, and Didymus, are generally eſteemed worthy of the firſt rank. It is however certain, that, even of theſe firſt-rate commentators, few have diſcovered a juſt diſcernment, or a ſound judgment, in their laborious expoſitions of the ſacred writings. Rufinus, Theodore of *Heraclea*, and Diodore of *Tarſus*, with ſome others, have, indeed, followed the natural ſignification of the words [b]; the reſt, after the example of Origen, are laborious in the ſearch of far-fetched interpretations, and pervert the expreſſions of ſcripture, which they but half underſtand, by applying them, or rather ſtraining them, to matters with which they have no connexion [c]. St. Augustin and Tychonius endeavoured to eſtabliſh plain and wiſe rules for the interpretation of ſcripture, but their efforts were unſucceſsful [d].

The method of explaining the doctrines of Chriſtianity, followed at this time.

V. The doctrines of Chriſtianity had not a better fate, than the ſacred ſcriptures from whence they are drawn. Origen was the great model, whom the moſt eminent of the Chriſtian doctors followed in their explications of the truths of the goſpel, which were, of conſequence, explained according to the rules of the Platonic philoſophy, as it was corrected and modified by that learned father for the inſtruction of the youth. Thoſe who deſire a more ample and accurate account of this matter, may conſult Gregory Nazianzen among the Greeks, and Augustin among the Latins, who were followed, for a long time, as the only patrons worthy of imitation, and who, next to Origen, may be conſidered as the parents and ſupporters of the *philoſophical* or *ſcholaſtic theology*. They were both zealous Platonics, and holding, for certain, all the tenets of that philoſpher that were not totally repugnant to the truths of Chriſtianity, they laid them down as fundamental principles, and drew from them a great variety of ſubtile concluſions, which neither Christ nor Plato ever thought of.

Platonics.

Myſtics.

This, however, was not the only ſect that flouriſhed at this time. That order of fanatics, who maintained, that the knowledge of divine things was to be acquired, not by reaſoning, but by ſtill contemplation, and, by turning the eye of the mind upon itſelf in an entire abſence from all external and ſenſible objects, became now more numerous, and increaſed every day. This appears from many circumſtances, particularly from the ſwarms of monks that almoſt overſpred the Chriſtian world; and alſo from the books of Dionysius, the pretended chief of the Myſtics, which ſeem to have been forged, in this century, under that venerable name by ſome member of that fanatical tribe.

The didactic writers.

VI. Among the writers of this century, who publiſhed expoſitions of the Chriſtian doctrine, the firſt place is due to Cyril of *Jeruſalem*, juſtly celebrated for his *catechetical diſcourſes*, which nothing but a partial blindneſs to the truth could have induced any to attribute to a more modern author [e]. Some have ranked LACTANTIUS in the claſs of writers now under conſideration, but without reaſon; ſince it is well known, that the labours of that eloquent author were rather employed in refuting the errors of idolatry, than in explaining the truths of the goſpel. The *ſyſtem of doctrine addreſſed to the clergy and laity*, and which, by many, has been attributed to ATHANASIUS, ſeems to be of a much later date. There are, however, many things in the works of CHRYSOSTOM, ATHANASIUS, the GREGORIES, and others, by which we may be enabled to form a juſt idea of the manner in which the principal points of the Chriſtian doctrine were explained by learned men in this century. We may more particularly be aſſiſted in this matter, by the XII books of HILARY, concerning the *Trinity*; the *Ancoratus* of EPIPHANIUS, in which the doctrine of ſcripture, concerning CHRIST *and the Holy Ghoſt*, is explained at large; the treatiſe of PACIAN, concerning *baptiſm*, addreſſed to the *catechumens*; and the two books of CHRYSOSTOM upon the ſame ſubject. We need not mention here the various works of JEROME and AUGUSTIN, in which appear the laborious and noble efforts of theſe great men to inſpire into the minds of the people juſt notions of religion, and to detect and refute the errors of thoſe who were enemies of the truth.

---

[b] Simon *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt. par* Du Pin, tom. i. p. 51. 90. 129. tom. iv. p. 335; as alſo *Hiſt. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. vi. p 88, &c.

[c] See Gregor. Nazianz. *Carmen de Seipſo*, in Tollius's *Inſignia Itineris Italici*, p. 27. 57.

[d] This may be ſeen in the vi books which Augustin wrote concerning the *Chriſtian doctrine*, and in the *rules* of interpretation laid down by Tichonius, which are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr. Maxim.* tom. vi. p. 48.

The ſtate of polemic divinity.

VII. The controverſial writings, that were levelled againſt thoſe who were conſidered as heretics, were entirely deſtitute of that ancient ſimplicity, that is the natural and the beautiful garb of truth. That ſimplicity was now ſucceeded by logical ſubtilties, acute ſophiſms, ſharp invectives, and other diſingenuous arts, more worthy of the patrons of error, than of the defenders of the *wiſdom that is from above*. We find, accordingly, many great and eminent men complaining of this abuſe, and endeavouring, in vain, to oppoſe the muddy torrent of ſcurrility and dialectic that was overflowing the Chriſtian ſchools [f]. I paſs in ſilence thoſe rhetorical figures and ornaments, by which many evaded the arguments of their adverſaries, and artfully perplexed the true ſtate of the caſe, that odious cuſtom, alſo, of exciting the popular reſentment againſt thoſe who differed from them, that was obſerved by ſome, and that total want of order and perſpicuity that was chargeable upon almoſt all. Several writers of this age are ſo far from diſowning theſe indecent qualities, that they ſeem, on the contrary, to glory in them. It muſt, indeed, be obſerved, that the adverſaries of the truth uſed the ſame inglorious arms, though this does not in the leaſt diminiſh the reproach that is on this account due to its friends.

Diſingenuous methods of diſputing uſed.

VIII. New methods of diſputing were alſo added to thoſe that were practiſed in former times: for the truth of doctrines was now proved by the number of martyrs that had profeſſed them, by miracles, by the confeſſion of *demons*, i. e. of perſons poſſeſſed with evil ſpirits. The ſmalleſt degree of diſcernment will perſuade any one how ambiguous this method of reaſoning was, how dangerous to the truth by furniſhing innumerable occaſions for the exerciſe of fraud and impoſture. And, I fear, that the greateſt part of thoſe who uſed ſuch arguments, however illuſtrious and reſpectable they may have been, will be found, upon examination, chargeable with the dangerous and criminal deſign of impoſing upon their brethren. AMBROSE, in his diſputes with the Arians, produced men poſſeſſed with devils, who, upon the approach of the relicks of GERVASIUS and PROTASIUS, were obliged to acknowledge, with loud cries, that the doctrine of the council of *Nice*, concerning the three perſons of the god-head, was true; and that of the Arians not only falſe, but alſo of moſt dangerous conſequence. This teſtimony of the prince of darkneſs was regarded, by AMBROSE, as an unexceptionable argument in favour of his Hypotheſis. The Arians, on the other hand, held this prodigy in the utmoſt deriſion, and maintained that AMBROSE had ſuborned theſe infernal witneſſes by a weighty bribe [*g*]; and I make no doubt, but many will be more diſpoſed to believe the Arians, than to credit AMBROSE, though he be enrolled in the order of the ſaints, and they ſtigmatized in the liſt of heretics [*h*].

---

[e] See JO. FECHTII *Comment. de origine miſſarum in honorem ſanctorum*, p. 404.

[f] METHODIUS apud EPIPHANIUM *Hæreſ.* lxiv. tom. i. Opp. p. 563. GREGOR. NAZIAN. in many places, and others.

The chief controverſialiſts.

IX. There were, in this century, ſeveral controverſialiſts of conſiderable note. For beſides APOLLINARIS, GREGORY NAZIANZEN, CYRIL of *Alexandria*, and others, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the liſts againſt the emperor JULIAN; many others diſputed with victorious force and an happy ſucceſs againſt the worſhipers of the gods. Of this number were LACTANTIUS, ATHANASIUS, JULIUS FIRMICUS MATERNUS, APOLLINARIS the younger, whoſe excellent writings againſt PORPHYRY are unhappily loſt; AUGUSTIN, in thoſe books *of the City of God*, and in the III books againſt the Pagans, which have alſo periſhed; and, above all, EUSEBIUS of *Cæſarea*, in his *evangelical preparation*, and his *book againſt* HIEROCLES. EUSEBIUS EMESENUS, DIODORE of *Tarſus*, and St. CHRYSOSTOM, whoſe treatiſe on that ſubject is ſtill extant, employed their learned labours, to bring over the Jews to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. EPHRAIM of *Syria* [*i*], JAMES of *Niſibis*, DIDYMUS and AUDENTIUS attacked the whole body of heretics; as did alſo EPIPHANIUS, in his voluminous work *concerning hereſies*, intitled, *Panarium*, and GREGORY NAZIANZEN with more brevity in his *diſcourſe concerning faith*. The books of AUGUSTIN and PHILASTRIUS, on the ſame ſubject, contain rather a liſt than a refutation of the ſeveral ſects.

Moral writers.

X. If the growth and perfection of a ſcience were to be eſtimated by the multitude of writers it produces, that of *morals* muſt have flouriſhed greatly at this time, for the number of thoſe was very conſiderable, who applied themſelves to that excellent ſtudy. Among the eaſtern writers JAMES, biſhop of *Niſibis* [*k*], and EPHRAIM, biſhop of *Syria*, became eminent for their zeal and aſſiduity in inculcating the precepts of morality. The writings of BASIL the GREAT, GREGORY of *Nyſſa*, CHRYSOSTOM, AMBROSE, AUGUSTIN, and ſeveral others, upon moral ſubjects, are neither worthy of high encomiums, nor of entire contempt, as they contain a ſtrange mixture of excellent reflexions, and inſipid details concerning the duties of the Chriſtian life. Among the productions of theſe writers, many give the preference to the III books of AMBROSE, *concerning the duty of the miniſters of the church*, which are written in the manner of CICERO, and are juſtly commended for the pious intention they diſcover, and the beautiful ſentiments they contain, though there be many things in them worthy of reprehenſion. But MACARIUS, an Egyptian monk [l], undoubtedly deſerves the firſt rank among the practical writers of this time, as his works diſplayed, ſome few things excepted [m], the brighteſt and moſt lovely portraiture of ſanctity and virtue.

[*g*] AMBROS. *Epiſt* xxii. p. 878, &c. PAULINUS, *vita Ambroſii*, p. 81.

[*h*] See LE CLERC *Appendix Auguſtiniana*, p. 375. GREGOR. NYSS. *vita Gregorii Neocæſarienſis*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 977, 978. SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Hiſt. Sacr.* lib. ii. cap. xxxviii. p. 261.

[*i*] See JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 118. 125. From the extracts, which this learned compiler has given of the works of EPHRAIM, it appears, that he was more diſtinguiſhed by his piety and genius, than by his ſkill in the managing of controverſy.

[*k*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANN. in the work quoted in the preceding note, tom. i. p. 17. thinks,

The defects of theſe moral writers.

XI. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that almoſt all the writers of this claſs are defective in ſeveral reſpects. They have been entirely negligent of order in their compoſitions, and have taken no ſort of care to treat with method and preciſion the ſubjects they undertook to explain. They ſeldom define their terms, and pour out their pious, but incoherent, ideas in fortuitous combinations, juſt as they come uppermoſt. They, moreover, neglect deducing the duties of mankind from their true principles, and even ſometimes derive them from doctrines and precepts that are either manifeſtly falſe, or, at leaſt, whoſe nature and meaning are not determined with any degree of accuracy. And hence it is, that the greateſt part of them are extremely defective, when they come to demonſtrate the *obligations* of virtue, and the *incongruity* and *unfitneſs* of vice. Theſe pretended demonſtrations, inſtead of being deduced by proper concluſions from the reaſon of things and the divine laws, are nothing more than a collection of airy fancies, cold and inſipid allegories, quaint and ſubtile conceits, which are more proper to afford amuſement to the imagination, than light to the underſtanding, or conviction to the judgment.

The number of the myſtics increaſed, and their doctrine propagated.

XII. But, however defective this method of inculcating the duties of morality may have been, it was much more tolerable than that which was followed by the amphibious diſciples of CHRIST and PLATO, thoſe Alexandrian philoſophers, of whom AMMONIUS SACCA was the chief. The *double doctrine* of morals which they invented, and which was compounded of two ſyſtems, the one ſurpaſſing the other in perfection, gained much ground, in this century, to the great detriment of true religion. A circumſtance every way proper to convince us of the growth and progreſs of this fanatical ſect, is, that thoſe, who in former times had inculcated a ſecret doctrine concerning divine things totally different from that which was publicly propagated among the multitude, gave now the finiſhing touch to this doctrine, and formed it into a ſyſtem. The famous Grecian fanatic, who gave himſelf out for DIONYSIUS the

---

that the writings attributed to the biſhop of *Niſibis*, belong rather to the biſhop of *Saruga*; he however corrects, in ſome meaſure, this notion in his *Addenda*, p. 558.

[l] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Januar. p. 1005.

[(m) The things here excepted by Dr. MOSHEIM, are ſome ſuperſtitious tenets that are to be found in the writings of MACARIUS, and alſo certain opinions that ſeem tainted with *origeniſm*.]

Areopagite, diſciple of St. PAUL, and who, under the protection of this venerable name, gave laws and inſtructions to thoſe that were deſirous of raiſing their ſouls above all human things, in order to unite them to their great ſource by ſublime contemplation, lived, moſt probably, in this century, though ſome place him before, others after the preſent period [n]. No ſooner were the writings and inſtructions of this fanatic handed about among the Greeks and Syrians, and particularly among the *ſolitaries* and monks, than a gloomy cloud of religious darkneſs began to ſpred itſelf over the minds of many. An incredible number of proſelytes was added to that chimerical ſect, who maintained, that communion with God was to be ſought by mortifying ſenſe, by withdrawing the mind from all external objects, by macerating the body with hunger and labour, and by a holy ſort of indolence, which confined all the activity of the ſoul to a lazy contemplation of things ſpiritual and eternal.

Monkiſh ſocieties.

XIII. The progreſs of this ſect appears evidently from the prodigious number of ſolitary monks and ſequeſtred virgins, which, upon the return of tranquillity to the church, had over-run the whole Chriſtian world with an amazing rapidity. Many of this order of men had, for a long time, been known among the Chriſtians, and had led ſilent and ſolitary lives in the deſarts of *Egypt*; but ANTONY was the firſt who formed them into a regular body, engaged them to live in ſociety with each other, and preſcribed to them fixed rules for the direction of their conduct [o]. Theſe regulations which ANTONY had made in *Egypt*, were, the year following, introduced into *Paleſtine* and *Syria* by his diſciple HILARION. Almoſt about the ſame time, AONES or EUGENIUS, with their companions, GADDANAS and AZYZUS, inſtituted the monaſtic order in *Meſopotamia*, and the adjacent countries [p]; and their example was followed with ſuch rapid ſucceſs, that, in a ſhort time, the whole eaſt was filled with a lazy ſet of mortals, who, abandoning all human connexions, advantages, pleaſures, and affairs, wore out a languiſhing and miſerable life amidſt the hardſhips of want, and various kinds of ſuffering, in order to arrive at a more cloſe and rapturous communion with God and angels. The Chriſtian church would never have been diſgraced by this cruel and unſociable enthuſiaſm, nor would any have been ſubjected to thoſe keen torments of mind and body to which it gave riſe, had not many Chriſtians been unwarily caught by the ſpecious appearance, and the pompous ſound of that maxim of the ancient philoſophy; “ That in order to the attainment of “ true felicity and communion with God, it was neceſſary that the ſoul ſhould “ be ſeparated from the body even here below, and that the body was to be “ macerated and mortified for this purpoſe.”

---

[n] Thoſe who have written concerning this impoſtor, are enumerated by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 175. See alſo JO. LAUNII *Judicium de ſcriptis Dionyſii*, tom. ii. Opp. part. I. p. 562. LA CROZE (in his *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſm d'Ethiopie*, p. 10.) endeavours to prove that SYNESIUS, an Egyptian biſhop, and alſo the moſt celebrated philoſopher of the fifth century, compoſed the writings attributed to DIONYSIUS, in order to defend the doctrine of thoſe who held that CHRIST was only poſſeſſed of *one nature*. The arguments, however, of LA CROZE are weak. Nor are thoſe more ſatisfactory, which the learned BARATIERE has employed, in a diſſertation added to his book *De ſucceſſione Rom. Epiſcop.* p. 286. to prove that DIONYSIUS of *Alexandria* was the true author of the writings in queſtion.

[o] For a full account of ANTONY, and the *diſcipline* eſtabliſhed by him, ſee the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Januar. *ad. d.* 17. p. 107.

[p] See JOS. SIMON. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p 48.

The progreſs of monkery.

XIV. From the eaſt this gloomy inſtitution paſſed into the weſt, and firſt into *Italy*, and its neighbouring iſlands, though it is utterly uncertain who tranſplanted it there [*q*]. St. MARTIN, the celebrated biſhop of *Tours*, erected the firſt monaſteries in *Gaul*, and recommended this religious ſolitude with ſuch power and efficacy, both by his inſtructions and his example, that his funeral is ſaid to have been attended by no leſs than two thouſand monks [*r*]. From hence, the monaſtic diſcipline extended, gradually, its progreſs through the other provinces and countries of Europe.

It is, however, proper to obſerve, that there was a great difference in point of auſterity between the weſtern and oriental monks; the former of whom could never be brought to bear the ſevere rules, to which the latter voluntarily ſubmitted. And, indeed, the reaſon of this difference may be partly derived from the nature of the reſpective climates in which they dwelt. The European countries abound not ſo much with delirious fanatics, and with perſons of a moroſe and auſtere complexion, as thoſe arid regions that lye towards the burning eaſt; nor are our bodies capable of ſupporting that rigorous and abſtemious method of living, which is familiar and eaſy to thoſe who are placed under a growing firmament, and breathe in a ſultry and ſcorching atmoſphere. It was, therefore, rather the name only, accompanied with a certain reſemblance or diſtant imitation of that monaſtic life, inſtituted by ANTONY and others in the eaſt, than the thing itſelf, which was tranſported into the European countries [*s*].

[*q*] Moſt writers, following the opinion of BARONIUS, maintain, that S. ATHANASIUS brought the *monaſtic inſtitution* from *Egypt* into *Italy*, in the year 340, and was the firſt who built a monaſtery at *Rome*. See MABILLONIUS *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Ord. Bened* tom. i. p. 9. But the learned LEWIS ANT. MURATORI combats this opinion, and pretends that the firſt monaſtery known in Europe, was erected at *Milan*, *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 361.—JUST. FONTANINUS, in his *Hiſtoria Litter. Aquileienſ.* p. 155. affirms, that the firſt ſociety of monks was formed at *Aquileia*. None of theſe writers produce unexceptionable evidence for their opinions. If we may give credit to the BALLERINI (*Diſſert.* ii. *ad Zenonem Veronenſem*, p. 115.) the firſt convent of nuns was erected, towards the end of this century, at *Verona*, by ZENO, biſhop of that city.

[*r*] See SULPIT. SEVER. *De vita Martini*, cap. x. p. 17. edit. Veron. where the method of living, uſed by the Martinian monks, is accurately deſcribed. See alſo *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i. part. II. p. 42.

[*s*] This difference between the *diſcipline* of the eaſtern and weſtern monks, and the cauſe of it, have been ingeniouſly remarked by SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. *De vita Martini*, p. 65. edit. Veron. where one of the interlocutors, in the dialogue, having mentioned the abſtemious and wretched diet of the Egyptian monks, adds what follows: “ Placetne tibi prandium, faſci- “ culus herbarum et panis dimidius viris quinque?” To this queſtion the Gaul anſwers, “ Facis tuo more, qui nullam occaſionem omittis, quin nos (*i. e.* the Gallic monks) edacitatis “ fatiges. Sed facis inhumane, qui nos Gallos homines cogis exemplo Angelorum vivere—Sed “ contentus ſit hoc prandio Cyrenenſis ille, cui vel neceſſitas vel natura eſt eſurire: nos, *quod* “ *tibi ſæpe teſtatus ſum, Galli ſumus.*” The ſame ſpeaker, in the abovementioned dialogue, ch. viii. p. 69, 70. reproaches JEROME with having accuſed the monks of gluttony; and proceeds thus; “ Sentio de orientalibus illum potius Monachis, quam de occidentalibus diſputaſſe. “ Nam edacitas in Græcis et Orientalibus gula eſt, IN GALLIS NATURA.” It appears therefore,

XV. The

Different orders of monks.

Cœnobites and Eremites, or Hermits.

XV. The monaſtic order, of which we have been taking a general view, was diſtributed into ſeveral claſſes. They were firſt divided into two diſtinct orders, of which the one received the denomination of Cœnobites, the other that of Eremites. The former lived together in a fixed habitation, and made up one large community under a chief, whom they called *father*, or *abbot*, which ſignifies the ſame thing in the Egyptian language. The latter drew out a wretched life in perfect ſolitude, and were ſcattered here and there in caves, in deſarts, in the hollow of rocks, ſheltered from the wild beaſts only by the cover of a miſerable cottage, in which each one lived ſequeſtred from the reſt of his ſpecies.

Anachorites.

The order of the Anachorites were yet more exceſſive in the auſterity of their manner of living than the Eremites. They frequented the wildeſt deſarts without either tents or cottages; nouriſhed themſelves with the roots and herbs which grew ſpontaneouſly out of the uncultivated ground; wandered about without having any fixed abode, and repoſing wherever the approach of night happened to find them; and all this, that they might *avoid the view and the ſociety of mortals* [t].

Sarabaites.

The laſt order of monks that come now under conſideration were thoſe wandering fanatics, or rather impoſtors, whom the Egyptians called Sarabaites, who, inſtead of procuring a ſubſiſtence by honeſt induſtry, travelled through various cities and provinces, and gained a maintenance by fictitious miracles, by ſelling relicks to the multitude, and other frauds of a like nature.

Many of the Cœnobites were chargeable with vitious and ſcandalous practices. This order, however, was not ſo univerſally corrupt as that of the Sarabaites, who were, for the moſt part, profligates of the moſt abandoned kind. As to the Eremites, they ſeem to have deſerved no other reproach than that of a delirious and extravagant fanaticiſm [u]. All theſe different orders were hitherto compoſed of the *laity*, and were ſubject to the juriſdiction and the inſpection of the biſhops. But many of them were now adopted among the *clergy*, and that even by the command of the emperors. Nay, the fame of monaſtic piety and ſanctity became ſo univerſal, that biſhops were frequently choſen out of that fanatical order [w].

Two moſt pernicious maxims adopted in this century.

XVI. If the enthuſiaſtic frenzy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the intereſts of morality, the diſcipline that is obligatory upon Chriſtians; the intereſts of virtue and true religion ſuffered yet more grievouſly by two monſtrous errors which were almoſt univerſally adopted in

---

that, immediately after the introduction of the monaſtic order into Europe, the weſtern differed greatly from the eaſtern monks in their manners and diſcipline, and were, in conſequence of this, accuſed by the latter of voraciouſneſs and gluttony.

[t] See SULPIT. SEVER. *Dial.* i. *De vita Martini*, cap. x p. 80. edit. Veron.

[u] Whoever is deſirous of a fuller account of the vices of the monks in this century, may conſult the abovementioned dialogue of SULP. SEVER. cap viii. p. 69, 70. cap. xxi. p. 88. where he particularly chaſtiſes the arrogance and ambition of thoſe of them, who aſpired to *clerical* honours. See alſo *Dial.* ii. cap. viii. p. 112. *Dial.* iii. cap. xv. p. 144, 145. *Conſultat. Apollonii et Zachæi*, publiſhed by DACHERIUS *Spicileg.* tom. i. lib. iii. cap. iii. p. 35.

[w] See J. GODOFRED. *ad codicem Theodoſianum*, tom. vi. part. I. p. 76. 106. edit. Ritterianæ.

this century, and became a ſource of innumerable calamities and miſchiefs in the ſucceeding ages. The firſt of theſe maxims was, that *it was an act of virtue, to deceive and lye, when by that means the intereſts of the church might be promoted*; and the ſecond equally horrible; though in another point of view, was, that *errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, were puniſhable with civil penalties and corporal tortures.* The former of theſe erroneous maxims was now of a long ſtanding; it had been adopted for ſome ages paſt, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unſpeakable detriment of that glorious cauſe in which they were employed. And it muſt be frankly confeſſed, that the greateſt men, and moſt eminent ſaints of this century, were more or leſs tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evidently to ſuch as look with an attentive eye into their writings and their actions. We would willingly except from this charge AMBROSE, and HILARY, AUGUSTIN, GREGORY NAZIANZEN, and JEROME; but truth, which is more reſpectable than theſe venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accuſation. We may add alſo, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged SULPITIUS SEVERUS, who is far from being, in the general, a puerile or credulous hiſtorian, to attribute ſo many miracles to St. MARTIN. The other maxim, relating to the juſtice and expediency of puniſhing error, was introduced with thoſe ſerene and peaceful times which the acceſſion of CONSTANTINE to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that period approved by many, enforced by ſeveral examples during the conteſts that aroſe with the Priſcillianiſts and Donatiſts, confirmed and eſtabliſhed by the authority of AUGUSTIN, and thus tranſmitted to the following ages.

The lives and morals of Chriſtians.

XVII. When we caſt an eye towards the lives and morals of Chriſtians at this time, we find, as formerly, a mixture of good and evil; ſome eminent for their piety, others infamous for their crimes. The number, however, of immoral and unworthy Chriſtians began ſo to increaſe, that the examples of real piety and virtue became extremely rare. When the terrors of perſecution were totally diſpelled; when the church, ſecured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the ſweets of proſperity and peace; when the moſt of the biſhops exhibited to their flock the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animoſity, and ſtrife, with other vices too numerous to mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into a ſlothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties of their reſpective ſtations, and employed, in vain, wranglings and idle diſputes, that zeal and attention, that were due to the culture of piety and to the inſtruction of their people; and when (to compleat the enormity of this horrid detail) multitudes were drawn into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the proſpect of gain and the fear of puniſhment; then it was, indeed, no wonder that the church was contaminated with ſhoals of profligate Chriſtians, and that the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppreſſed and overwhelmed with the ſuperior numbers of the wicked and licentious. It is true, that the ſame rigorous penitence, which had taken place before CON-

STANTINE the GREAT, continued now in full force againſt flagrant tranſgreſſors; but when the reign of corruption becomes univerſal, the vigour of the laws yields to its ſway, and a weak execution defeats the purpoſes of the moſt ſalutary diſcipline. Such was now unhappily the caſe: the age was ſinking daily from one period of corruption to another; the great and the powerful ſinned with impunity; and the obſcure and the indigent felt alone the ſeverity of the laws.

The Meletian controverſy.

XVIII. Religious controverſies among Chriſtians were frequent in this century; and, as it often happens in the courſe of civil affairs, external peace gave occaſion and leiſure for the fomenting inteſtine troubles and diſſenſions. We ſhall mention ſome of the principal of theſe controverſies, which produced violent and obſtinate ſchiſms, not ſo much, indeed, by their natural tendency, as by incidental occurrences.

In the beginning of this century, about the year 306, aroſe the famous Meletian controverſy, ſo called from its author, and which, for a long time, divided the church. PETER, biſhop of *Alexandria*, had depoſed, from the epiſcopal office, MELETIUS, biſhop of *Lycopolis*, in the *Upper Egypt*. The reaſons that occaſioned this violent act of authority have not been ſufficiently expoſed. The partiſans of PETER allege, that MELETIUS had ſacrificed to the gods, and charge him alſo with various crimes [x]; while others affirm, that his only failing was an exceſſive ſeverity againſt the *lapſed* [y]. Be that as it will, MELETIUS treated the ſentence of PETER with the utmoſt contempt, and did not only continue to perform all the duties of the epiſcopal function, but even aſſumed the right of conſecrating preſbyters; a privilege which, by the laws of *Egypt*, belonged only to the biſhop of *Alexandria*. The venerable gravity and eloquence of MELETIUS drew many to his party, and, among others, a conſiderable number of monks adhered to his cauſe. The council of *Nice* made ſeveral ineffectual attempts to heal this breach: the Meletians, on the other hand, whoſe chief aim was to oppoſe the authority of the biſhop of *Alexandria*, joined themſelves to the Arians, who were his irreconcileable enemies. Hence it happened, that a diſpute, which had, for its firſt object, the authority and juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Alexandria*, degenerated, gradually, into a religious controverſy. The Meletian party was yet ſubſiſting in the fifth century [z].

The Euſtathian troubles.

XIX. Some time after this, a certain perſon, named EUSTATHIUS, was the occaſion of great diſorders and diviſions in *Armenia*, *Pontus*, and the neighbouring countries; and was condemned and excommunicated, in conſequence thereof, by the council of *Gangra*, which was held not long after that of *Nice*. Whether this was the ſame EUSTATHIUS, who was biſhop of *Sebaſtia*, in *Armenia*, and the chief of the Semi-arians; or whether the ancient hiſtorians have confounded together two different perſons of the ſame name, is a matter extremely difficult to determine [*a*]. However that be, the leader of the Euſtathian ſect does not ſeem ſo much chargeable with a corruption of any religious doctrine, as with having ſet up a fanatical form of ſanctity; an extravagant ſyſtem of practical diſcipline, deſtructive of the order and happineſs of ſociety. For he prohibited marriage, the uſe of wine and fleſh, feaſts of charity, and other things of that nature. He preſcribed immediate divorce to thoſe who were joined in wedlock, and is ſaid to have granted to children and ſervants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and maſters upon pretexts of a religious nature [*b*].

---

[x] ATHANASIUS, *Apologia ſecunda*, tom. i. Opp. p. 777.

[y] EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreſ.* lxviii. tom. i. Opp. p. 716; ſee alſo DION. PETAVIUS, *Not. in Epiphanium*, tom. ii. p. 274. SAM. BASNAGII *Exercitat. de rebus ſacris contra Baronium.*

[z] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. c. vi. p. 14. THEODORET. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. viii. p. 548.

Luciferian diviſions.

XX. Lucifer, biſhop of *Cagliari* in *Sardinia*, a man remarkable for his prudence, the auſterity of his character, and the ſteddineſs of his reſolution and courage, was baniſhed, by the emperor Constantius, for having defended the Nicene doctrine, concerning the three perſons in the God-head. He broke the bonds of fraternal communion with Eusebius, biſhop of *Verceil*, in the year 363, becauſe the latter had conſecrated Paulinus biſhop of *Antioch*; and he afterwards ſeparated himſelf from the whole church, on account of the act of abſolution it had paſſed in favour of thoſe, who, under Constantius, had deſerted to the Arians [*c*]. It is, at leaſt, certain, that the ſmall tribe that followed this prelate, under the title of Luciferians, avoided ſcrupulouſly and obſtinately all commerce and fellowſhip both with thoſe biſhops who had declared themſelves in favour of the Arians, and with thoſe alſo who conſented to an abſolution for ſuch as returned from this deſertion, and acknowledged their error; and thus of conſequence they diſſolved the bonds of their communion with the church in general [*d*]. The Luciferians are alſo ſaid to have entertained erroneous notions concerning the human ſoul, whoſe generation they conſidered as of a carnal nature, and maintained that it was transfuſed from the parents into the children [*e*].

The Ærian controverſy.

XXI. About this time, Ærius, a preſbyter, monk, and Semi-arian, erected a new ſect, and excited diviſions throughout *Armenia*, *Pontus*, and *Cappadocia*, by propagating opinions different from thoſe that were commonly received. One of his principal tenets was, that biſhops were not diſtinguiſhed from preſbyters by any divine right; but that, according to the inſtitution of the New Teſtament, their offices and authority were abſolutely the ſame. How far Ærius purſued this opinion, through its natural conſequences, is not certainly known; but we know, with the utmoſt certainty, that it was highly agreeable to many good Chriſtians, who were no longer able to bear the tyranny and arrogance of the biſhops of this century.

[*a*] See Sam. Basnag. *Annal. Polit. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 840.

[*b*] Socrates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. xliii. p. 156. Sozomenus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 520. lib. iv. cap. xxiv. p. 581. Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* lxvi. p. 910. Philostorgius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. xvi. p. 53. 59. Wolfg. Gundling. *Not. ad Concilium Gangrenſe*, p. 9.

[*c*] Rufin. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. 30. p. 174. Socrates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. ix. p. 181, &c. See alſo Tillemont, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. vii. p. 521. edit. Paris.

[*d*] See in the *works* of Sirmond, tom. ii. p. 229, &c. *A book of prayers*, addreſſed to Theodosius by Marcellinus and Faustinus, who were Luciferians.

[*e*] Augustin. *De hæreſ.* cap. lxxxi. with the obſervations of Lamb. Dannæus, p. 346.

There were other things in which Ærius differed from the common notions of the time: he condemned prayers for the dead, ſtated faſts, the celebration of Eaſter, and other rites of that nature, in which the multitude erroneouſly imagine that the life and ſoul of religion conſiſts [*f*]. His great purpoſe ſeems to have been that of reducing Chriſtianity to its primitive ſimplicity: a purpoſe, indeed, laudable and noble when conſidered in itſelf; though the principles from whence it ſprings, and the means by which it is executed, are generally, in many reſpects, worthy of cenſure, and may have been ſo in the caſe of this reformer [*g*].

Jovinian.

XXII. The progreſs of ſuperſtition in this century, and the erroneous notions that prevailed concerning the true nature of religion, excited the zeal and the efforts of many to ſtem the torrent. But their labours only expoſed them to infamy and reproach. The moſt eminent of theſe worthy oppoſers of the reigning ſuperſtitions was Jovinian, an Italian monk, who, towards the concluſion of this century, taught firſt at *Rome*, and afterwards at *Milan*, that all thoſe who kept the vows they made to Christ at their baptiſm, and lived according to thoſe rules of piety and virtue laid down in the goſpel, had an equal title to the rewards of futurity; and that, conſequently, thoſe who paſſed their days in unſociable celibacy, and ſevere mortifications and faſtings, were, in no reſpect, more acceptable in the eye of God, than thoſe who lived virtuouſly in the bonds of marriage, and nouriſhed their bodies with moderation and temperance. Theſe judicious opinions, which many began to adopt, were firſt condemned by the church of *Rome*, and afterwards, by Ambrose, in a council held at *Milan* in the year 390 [*h*]. The emperor Honorius ſeconded the authoritative proceedings of the biſhops by the violence of the ſecular arm, anſwered the judicious reaſonings of Jovinian by the terror of coercive and penal laws, and baniſhed this pretended heretic to the iſland *Boa.* JOVINIAN publiſhed his opinions in a book, againſt which JEROME, in the following century, wrote a moſt bitter and abuſive treatiſe, which is ſtill extant [*i*].

[*f*] Epiphanius, *Hæreſ.* lxxv. p. 905. Augustin. *De hæreſ.* cap. liii.

[*g*] [The deſire of reducing religious worſhip to the greateſt poſſible ſimplicity, however rational it may appear in itſelf, and abſtractedly conſidered, will be conſiderably moderated in ſuch as beſtow a moment's attention upon the imperfection and infirmities of human nature in its preſent ſtate. Mankind, generally ſpeaking, have too little elevation of mind to be much affected with thoſe forms and methods of worſhip, in which there is nothing ſtriking to the outward ſenſes. The great difficulty here lies in determining the lengths, which it is prudent to go in the accommodation of religious ceremonies to human infirmity; and the grand point, is to fix a medium, in which a due regard may be ſhewn to the ſenſes and imagination, without violating the dictates of right reaſon, or tarniſhing the purity of true religion. It has been ſaid, that the Romiſh church has gone too far in its condeſcenſion to the infirmities of mankind. And this is what the ableſt defenders of its motley worſhip have alleged in its behalf. But this obſervation is not juſt: the church of *Rome* has not ſo much accommodated itſelf to *human weakneſs*, as it has abuſed that *weakneſs*, by taking occaſion from it to eſtabliſh an endleſs variety of ridiculous ceremonies, deſtructive of true religon, and only adapted to promote the riches and deſpotiſm of the clergy, and to keep the multitude ſtill hood-winked in their ignorance and ſuperſtition. How far a juſt antipathy to the church puppet-ſhows of the papiſts has unjuſtly driven ſome proteſtant churches into the oppoſite extreme, is a matter that I ſhall not now examine, though it certainly deſerves a ſerious conſideration.]

[*h*] Hieronymus *in Jovinianum*, tom. ii. Opp. Augustin. *De hæreſ.* cap. lxxxii. Ambros. *Epiſt.* vi, &c.

Controverſies relating to Origen.

XXIII. Among all the religious controverſies that divided the church, the moſt celebrated, both for their importance and their duration, were thoſe relating to ORIGEN and his doctrine.

This illuſtrious man, though he had been, for a long time, charged with many errors, was held, by the moſt part of Chriſtians, in the higheſt veneration, and his name was ſo ſacred as to give weight to the cauſe in which it appeared. The Arians, who were ſagacious in ſearching for ſuccours on all ſides to maintain their ſect, affirmed, that ORIGEN had adopted their opinions. In this they were believed by ſome, who conſequently included this great man in the hatred they entertained againſt the ſect of the Arians. But ſeveral writers of the firſt learning and note oppoſed this report, and endeavoured to vindicate the honour of their maſter from theſe injurious inſinuations. The moſt eminent of theſe was EUSEBIUS biſhop of *Cæſarea,* as appears by his learned work, intitled, *An apology for Origen.* It is extremely probable, that theſe clamours raiſed againſt the memory and reputation of a man, whom the whole Chriſtian world contemplated with reſpect, would have been ſoon huſhed, had it not been for the riſe of new commotions, which proceeded from another ſource, and of which we ſhall treat in the following ſection.

The progreſs of theſe controverſies.

XXIV. The monks in general, and the Egyptian monks in particular, were enthuſiaſtically devoted to ORIGEN, and ſpared no labour to propagate his opinions in all places. Their zeal, however, met with oppoſition, nor could they perſuade all Chriſtians of the truth and ſoundneſs of the notions invented or adopted by that eminent writer. Hence aroſe a controverſy concerning the reaſons and foundations of *Origeniſm,* which was at firſt managed in a private manner, but afterwards, by degrees, broke out into an open flame. Among the numerous partiſans of ORIGEN was JOHN, biſhop of *Jeruſalem,* which furniſhed EPIPHANIUS and JEROME with a pretext to caſt an odium upon this prelate, againſt whom they had been previouſly exaſperated on other accounts. But the ingenious biſhop conducted matters with ſuch admirable dexterity, that, in defending himſelf, he vindicated, at the ſame time, the reputation of ORIGEN, and drew to his party the whole monaſtic body; and alſo a prodigious number of thoſe, who were ſpectators of this intereſting combat. This was but the beginning of the vehement conteſts concerning the doctrine of ORIGEN, that were carried on both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. Theſe conteſts were particularly fomented in the weſt by RUFINUS, a preſbyter of *Aquileia,* who tranſlated into Latin ſeveral books of ORIGEN, and inſinuated, with ſufficient plainneſs, that he acquieſced in the ſentiments they contained [*k*], which drew upon him the implacable rage of the learned and choleric JEROME. But theſe commotions ſeemed to ceaſe in the weſt after the death of RUFINUS; and the efforts which men of the firſt order made to check both by their authority and by their writings the progreſs of *Origeniſm* in thoſe parts.

[*i*] *Codex Theodoſianus,* tom. iii. p. 218. tom. vi. p. 193.

[*k*] See JUST. FONTANINUS, *Hiſtoria Litterar. Aquleienſis,* lib. iv. cap. iii. p. 177, &c.

Controverſy in the eaſt, concerning the writings of Origen.

XXV. The troubles which the writings and doctrines of Origen excited in the eaſt were more grievous and laſting. Theophilus, biſhop of *Alexandria*, irritated, for ſeveral reaſons, againſt the Nitrian monks, repreſented them as infected with the contagion of *Origeniſm*, and ordered them to give up and abandon all the productions of Origen. The monks refuſed obedience to this command, and alleged in their defence two conſiderations; the one, that the paſſages in the writings of this holy and venerable man, which ſeemed to ſwerve from the truth, were inſerted in them by ill-deſigning heretics; and the other, that a few things worthy of cenſure were not ſufficient to juſtify the condemnation of the reſt. Matters were but more exaſperated by this refuſal of ſubmiſſion to the order of Theophilus; for this violent prelate called a council, at *Alexandria*, in the year 399, in which, having condemned the followers of Origen, he ſent a band of ſoldiers to drive the monks from their reſidence on mount *Nitria*. The poor monks, ſcattered abroad thus by an armed force, fled firſt to *Jeruſalem*, from whence they retired afterwards to *Scythopolis*; and, finding that they could live here in ſecurity and peace, determined, at length, to ſet ſail for *Conſtantinople*, and there plead their cauſe in preſence of the emperor [*l*]. The iſſue of theſe proceedings comes under the hiſtory of the following century.

It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve here, that we muſt not reduce to the ſame claſs all thoſe who are called Origeniſts in the records of this century. For this ambiguous title is applied to perſons who differed widely in their religious notions. Sometimes it merely ſignifies ſuch friends of Origen, as acknowledged his writings to have been adulterated in many places, and who were far from patronizing the errors of which he was accuſed; in other places, this title is attributed to thoſe who confeſs Origen to be the author of the doctrines which are imputed to him, and who reſolutely ſupport and defend his opinions; of which latter there was a conſiderable number among the monaſtic orders.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

A multitude of ceremonies introduced.

I. WHILE the Roman emperors were ſtudious to promote the honour of Chriſtianity, by the auſpicious protection they afforded to the church, and their moſt zealous efforts to advance its intereſts; the inconſiderate and ill-directed piety of the biſhops caſt a cloud over the beauty and ſimplicity of the goſpel, by the prodigious number of rites and ceremonies which they had invented to embelliſh it. And here we may apply that well-known ſaying of AUGUSTIN [m], that *the yoke under which the Jews formerly groaned, was more tolerable than that impoſed upon many Chriſtians in his time.* The rites and inſtitutions, by which the Greeks, Romans, and other nations had formerly teſtified their religious veneration for fictitious deities, were now adopted, with ſome ſlight alterations, by Chriſtian biſhops, and employed in the ſervice of the true God. We have already mentioned the reaſons alleged for this imitation, ſo proper to diſguſt all who have a juſt ſenſe of the native beauty of genuine Chriſtianity. Theſe fervent heralds of the goſpel, whoſe zeal out-run their candour and ingenuity, imagined that the nations would receive Chriſtianity with more facility, when they ſaw the rites and ceremonies to which they were accuſtomed, adopted in the church, and the ſame worſhip paid to CHRIST and his martyrs, which they had formerly offered to their idle deities. Hence it happened, that in theſe times the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed very little in its external appearance from that of the Chriſtians. They had both a moſt pompous and ſplendid ritual. Gorgeous robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, croiſiers [n], proceſſions [o], luſtrations, images, gold and ſilver vaſes, and many ſuch circumſtances of pageantry were equally to be ſeen in the heathen temples and the Chriſtian churches.

[*l*] See Peter. Daniel Huet, *Origenianorum* lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 196. Louis Doucin, *Hiſtoire d'Origeniſme*, liv. iii. p. 95. Hier. a Prato, *Diſſ.* vi. *in Sulpitium Severum de Monachis b Origenis nomen ex Nitria totaque Ægypto pulſis*, p. 273. Veron. 1741, folio.

Magnificent churches erected.

II. No ſooner had CONSTANTINE the GREAT aboliſhed the ſuperſtitions of his anceſtors, than magnificent churches were every where erected for the Chriſtians, which were richly adorned with pictures and images, and bore a ſtriking reſemblance of the Pagan temples, both in their outward and inward form [p]. Of theſe churches ſome were built over the tombs of martyrs, and were frequented only at ſtated times; while others were ſet apart for the ordinary aſſemblies of Chriſtians in divine worſhip. The former were called Martyria, from the places where they were erected; and the latter Tituli [q]. Both of them were conſecrated with great pomp, and with certain rites borrowed, moſtly, from the ancient laws of the Roman pontifs.

---

[m] AUGUSTIN. *Epiſt.* cxix. *ad Januarium,* according to the ancient diviſion.

[(n) The *Lituus,* which, among the ancient Romans, was the chief enſign of the augurs, and which derived its name from its reſemblance of the *military trumpet,* became a mark of epiſcopal dignity. We call it the *croſier,* or biſhop's-ſtaff.]

[(o) The word *ſupplicationes,* which I have rendered by that of *proceſſions,* ſignified, among the Pagans, thoſe ſolemn and public acts of *gratitude* for national bleſſings, or *deprecation* of national calamities, which were expreſſed by the whole body of the people by a religious approach to the temples of the gods, which, by a decree of the ſenate, were open for all without diſtinction. See *Cic. Catil.* iii. 6. liv. x. 23.]

[p] See EZEK. SPANHEIM, *Preuves ſur les Ceſars de Julien,* p. 47. and particularly LE BRUN's *Explication litteraire et hiſtorique des Ceremonies de la Meſſe,* tom. ii. p. 101. A deſcription of theſe churches may be found in EUSEBIUS, *De vita Conſtantini M.* lib. iii. cap. xxxv. and an exact plan of the interiour ſtructure of them is accurately engraved in biſhop BEVEREGE's *Adnotationes in Pandectas Canonum,* tom. ii. p. 70. and in FREDERICK SPANHEIM's *Inſtitut. Hiſt. Eccleſ.* tom. i, Opp. p. 860.—It muſt alſo be obſerved, that certain parts of the Chriſtian churches were formed after the model of the Jewiſh temples. See CAMP. VITRINGA, *De ſynagoga veteri,* lib. i.i. p. 466.

[q] JO. MABILLON. *Muſei Italici,* tom. ii. *in Comment. ad ordin. Roman.* p. xvi. [The *Tituli* were the ſmaller churches, ſo called from this circumſtance, that the preſbyters, who officiated in them, were called by the names of the places where they were erected, *i. e.* received titles, which fixed them to thoſe particular cures.]

Origin of the right of patronage.

But our wonder will not ceaſe here; it will rather be augmented when we learn, that, at this time, it was looked upon as an eſſential part of religion to have, in every country, a multitude of churches; and hence the true and only origin of what is called the *right of patronage*, which was introduced among Chriſtians with no other view than to encourage the opulent to erect a great number of churches, by giving them the privilege of appointing the miniſters that were to officiate in them [r]. This was a new inſtance of that ſervile imitation of the ancient ſuperſtitions which reigned at this time; for it was a very common notion among the people of old, that nations and provinces were happy and free from danger, in proportion to the number of fanes and temples, which they conſecrated to the worſhip of gods and heros, whoſe protection and ſuccour could not fail, as it was thought, to be ſhed abundantly upon thoſe, who worſhiped them with ſuch zeal, and honoured them with ſo many marks of veneration and reſpect. The Chriſtians unhappily contracted the ſame erroneous way of thinking. The greater the number of temples was, which they erected in honour of Christ, and his choſen friends and followers, the more ſanguine did their expectations grow of powerful ſuccours from them, and of a peculiar intereſt in the divine protection. They were ſo weak as to imagine, that God, Christ, and celeſtial intelligences were delighted with thoſe marks and teſtimonies of reſpect, which captivate the hearts of wretched mortals.

The form of public worſhip.

III. The Chriſtian worſhip conſiſted in hymns, prayers, the reading of the ſcriptures, a diſcourſe addreſſed to the people, and concluded with the celebration of the Lord's ſupper. To theſe were added various rites, more adapted to pleaſe the eyes, and ſtrike the imagination, than to kindle in the heart the pure and ſacred flame of genuine piety [s]. We are not, however, to think, that the ſame method of worſhip was uniformly followed in every Chriſtian ſociety, for this was far from being the caſe. Every biſhop conſulting his own private judgment, and taking into conſideration the nature of the times, the genius of the country in which he lived, and the character and temper of thoſe whom he was appointed to rule and inſtruct, formed ſuch a plan of divine worſhip as he thought the wiſeſt and the beſt. Hence that variety of *liturgies* which were in uſe, before the biſhop of *Rome* had uſurped the ſupreme power in religious matters, and perſuaded the credulous and unthinking, that the model both of doctrine and worſhip was to be given by the mother-church, and to be followed implicitly throughout the Chriſtian world.

Changes introduced into many parts of divine worſhip.

IV. It would be almoſt endleſs to enter into a minute detail of all the different parts of public worſhip, and to point out the diſadvantageous changes they underwent. A few obſervations will be ſufficient upon this head. The public prayers had now loſt much of that ſolemn and majeſtic ſimplicity, that characteriſed them in the primitive times, and which were, at preſent, degenerating into a vain and ſwelling bombaſt. The pſalms of *David* were now received among the public hymns that were ſung as a part of divine ſervice [*t*]. The ſermons, or public diſcourſes addreſſed to the people, were compoſed according to the rules of human eloquence, and rather adapted to excite the ſtupid admiration of the populace, who delight in vain embelliſhments, than to enlighten the underſtanding, or to reform the heart. Nay, it would ſeem as if all poſſible means had been induſtriouſly uſed, to give an air of folly and extravagance to the Chriſtian aſſemblies. For the people were permitted, nay, even exhorted by the preacher himſelf, to crown his talents with clapping of hands and loud acclamations of applauſe [*u*]; a recompenſe that was hitherto peculiar to the actors on the theatre, and the orators in the Forum. How men ſet apart by their profeſſion to exhibit examples of the contempt of vain glory, and to demonſtrate to others the vanity and emptineſs of all temporal things, could indulge ſuch a ſenſeleſs and indecent ambition, is difficult to be conceived, though it is highly to be deplored.

---

[r] Just. Henn. Böhmeri *Jus Ecclеſ. Proteſtant.* tom. iii. p. 466. *Bibliotheque Italique*, tom. v. p. 166.

[s] For a full account of the form of public worſhip, or the *liturgies* of this century, the reader will do well to conſult the 22d *catechetical diſcourſe of* Cyril of *Jeruſalem*, and the *apoſtolical conſtitutions*, which are falſely attributed to Clement of *Rome*. Theſe writers are moſt learnedly illuſtrated and explained by Peter le Brun, in his *Explication litterale et hiſtorique de la Meſſe*, tom. ii. p. 53.

Feſtivals or holidays.

V. The firſt day of the week, which was the ordinary and ſtated time for the public aſſemblies of Chriſtians, was, in conſequence of a peculiar law enacted by CONSTANTINE, obſerved with more ſolemnity than it had formerly been [*w*]. The feſtivals celebrated, in moſt of the Chriſtian churches, were five in number, and were appointed in commemoration of the birth, the ſufferings and death, the reſurrection, and the aſcenſion of the divine Saviour; and alſo of the effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt upon the apoſtles and firſt heralds of the goſpel on the day of Pentecoſt. Of theſe feſtivals, none were kept with ſo much ſolemnity and reſpect, as the XIV days, that were appointed for the commemoration of CHRIST's reſurrection [*x*].

The eaſtern Chriſtians celebrated the memory of CHRIST's birth and baptiſm in one feſtival, which was fixed on the ſixth of January, and this day was by them called the *Epiphany*, as on it the immortal Saviour was manifeſted to the world [*y*]. On the other hand, the Chriſtians of the weſt ſeem to have always celebrated the birth of our Lord on the XXV of December: for there appears to be very little certainty in the accounts of thoſe, who allege that the Roman pontif, JULIUS I, removed the feſtival of CHRIST's birth from the ſixth of January to the twenty-fifth of December [*z*].

The unlucky ſucceſs which ſome had in diſcovering the carcaſes and remains of certain holy men, multiplied the *feſtivals* and *commemorations of the martyrs* in the moſt extravagant manner. The increaſe of theſe feſtivals would not have been offenſive to the wiſe and the good, if Chriſtians had employed the time they took up, in promoting their ſpiritual intereſts, and

---

[t] BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſtoire du Manicheiſme*, tom. ii. p. 614.

[u] FRANC. BERNH. FERRARIUS, *De veterum acclamationibus et plauſu*, p. 66.

[w] JAC. GODOFRED, *ad codicem Theodoſ.* tom. i. p. 135.

[x] GODOFRED, *ad codicem Theodoſ.* tom. i. p. 143.

[y] BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſt. de Manicheiſme*, tom. ii. p. 693.

[z] See JOS. SIM. ASSEMANN. *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 164. ALPH. des VIGNOLES, *Diſſ. dans la Bibliotheque Germanique*, tom. ii. p. 29.

in forming habits of ſanctity and virtue. But the contrary happened: theſe days, which were ſet apart for pious exerciſes, were ſquandered away in indolence, voluptuouſneſs, and criminal purſuits, and were leſs conſecrated to the ſervice of God, than employed in the indulgence of ſinful paſſions. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of ſinning were offered to the licentious, by what was called the vigils of Eaſter and Whitſuntide, or Pentecoſt.

Faſting.

VI. *Faſting* was conſidered, in this century, as the moſt effectual and powerful means of repelling the force, and diſconcerting the ſtratagems of evil ſpirits, and of appeaſing the anger of an offended deity. Hence we may eaſily underſtand what induced the rulers of the church to eſtabliſh this cuſtom by expreſs laws, and to impoſe, as an indiſpenſable duty, an act of humiliation; the obſervation of which had hitherto been left to every one's choice. The *Quadrageſimal*, or *Lent faſt*, was held more ſacred than all the reſt, though it was not as yet confined to a fixed number of days [a]. We muſt, however, remark, that the *faſts* obſerved in this century were very different from thoſe that were ſolemnized in the preceding times. Formerly thoſe, who ſubmitted themſelves to the diſcipline of faſting, abſtained wholly from meat and drink; but now a mere abſtinence from fleſh and wine was, by many, judged ſufficient for the purpoſes of faſting [b], and this latter opinion prevailed, from this time, and became univerſal among the Latins.

The adminiſtration of baptiſm,

VII. *Baptiſmal* fonts were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious adminiſtration of that initiating ſacrament. *Baptiſm* was adminiſtred during the vigils of Eaſter and Whitſuntide, with lighted tapers, by the biſhop, and the preſbyters commiſſioned by him for that purpoſe. In caſes, however, of urgent neceſſity, and in ſuch only, a diſpenſation was granted for performing this ſacred right at other times, than thoſe now mentioned. In ſome places *ſalt* was employed, as a ſymbol of purity and wiſdom, and was thrown, with this view, into the mouth of the perſon baptized; and a *double unction* was every where uſed in the celebration of this ordinance, one preceding its adminiſtration, and the other following it. The perſons, who were admitted into the church, by baptiſm, were obliged, after the celebration of that holy ordinance, to go cloathed in white garments during the ſpace of ſeven days.

Many other rites and ceremonies might be mentioned here; but as they neither acquired ſtability by their duration, nor received the ſanction of univerſal approbation and conſent, we ſhall paſs them over in ſilence.

and of the Lord's ſupper.

VIII. The inſtitution of *catechumens*, and the diſcipline through which they paſſed, ſuffered no variation in this century, but continued ſtill upon its ancient footing. It appears farther, by innumerable teſtimonies, that the Lord's ſupper was adminiſtred (in ſome places two or three times a week, in others, on Sunday only) to all thoſe who were aſſembled together to worſhip God. It was alſo ſometimes celebrated at the tombs of martyrs, and at funerals, which cuſtom, undoubtedly, gave riſe to the *maſſes*, that were afterwards per-

---

[a] Jo. Dallæus, *De Jejuniis et Quadrageſima*, lib. iv.

[b] See Barbeyrac, *De la Morale des Peres*, p. 250.

CENT. IV.

formed in honour of the ſaints, and for the benefit of the dead. In many places, the bread and wine were held up to view before their diſtribution, that they might be ſeen by the people, and contemplated with a certain religious reſpect; and hence, not long after, the *adoration of the ſymbols* was unqueſtionably derived. Neither *catechumens*, *penitents*, nor thoſe who were ſuppoſed to be under the influence and impulſe of evil ſpirits, were admitted to this holy ordinance; nor did the ſacred orators in their public diſcourſes ever dare to unfold its true and genuine nature with freedom and ſimplicity. The reaſon of thus concealing it from the knowledge and obſervation of many, was a very mean and ſhameful one, as we have already obſerved: many, indeed, offer a much more decent and ſatisfactory argument in favour of this cuſtom, when they allege, that, by theſe *myſterious* proceedings, the deſire of the *catechumens* would naturally burn to penetrate, as ſoon as was poſſible, the ſublime ſecret, and that they would thereby be animated to prepare themſelves with double diligence for receiving this privilege.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the hereſies and diviſions, that troubled the church during this century.

The remains of the ancient ſects.

I. THE ſects which had ſprung up in the preceding ages, tranſmitted their contagious principles to this century. Many of them remained yet, particularly in the eaſt, and, notwithſtanding their abſurdity, continued to attract a certain number of followers. The Manichean faction ſurpaſſed the reſt in its influence and progreſs. The very turpitude and enormity of its doctrines ſeemed to ſeduce many into its ſnares; and, what is ſtill more ſurprizing, men of genius and penetration were deluded by its enchantments, as the example of AUGUSTIN ſufficiently teſtifies. It is true, the wiſeſt and moſt learned writers of the times, and among others AUGUSTIN, when he returned from his errors, endeavoured to oppoſe the growth of this ſpreading peſtilence, nor were their efforts entirely unſucceſsful. But the root of this horrible diſeaſe was deep; and neither the force of argument, nor the ſeverity of the moſt rigorous laws, were ſufficient to extirpate it thoroughly [*c*]. For ſome time, indeed, it ſeemed to diſappear, and many thought it utterly eradicated; but it gathered force ſecretly, and broke out afterwards with new violence. To avoid the ſeverity of the laws, the Manicheans concealed themſelves under a variety of names, which they adopted ſucceſſively, and changed, in proportion, as they were diſcovered under them. Thus they aſſumed the names of Encratites, Apotactics, Saccophori, Hydroparaſtates, Solitaries, and ſeveral others, under which they lay concealed for a certain time, but could not, however, long eſcape the vigilance of their enemies [d].

[*c*] The ſevere laws enacted by the emperors againſt the Manicheans, are to be found in the *Theodoſian Code*, vol. vi. part I. edit. Ritterian. In the year 372, VALENTINIAN the elder, prohibited their aſſemblies, and impoſed heavy penalties on their doctors, p. 126. In 381, THEODOSIUS the GREAT branded them with infamy, and deprived them of all the rights and privileges of citizens, p. 133. Add to theſe many edicts yet more dreadful, which may be ſeen in the 137, 138. 170 pages of the abovementioned work.

The riſe of the controverſy with the Donatiſts.

II. The ſtate had little danger to apprehend from a ſect, which the force of ſevere laws and of penal reſtraints could not fail to undermine, gradually, throughout the Roman empire. But a new and much more formidable faction ſtarted up in *Africa*, which, though it aroſe from ſmall beginnings, afflicted moſt grievouſly both church and ſtate for more than a century. Its origin was as follows:

Mensurius, biſhop of *Carthage*, in *Africa*, dying in the year 311, the greateſt part of the clergy and people choſe, in his place, the archdeacon Cæcilianus, who, without waiting for the aſſembly of the Numidian biſhops, was conſecrated by thoſe of *Africa* alone. This haſty proceeding was the occaſion of much trouble. The Numidian biſhops, who had always been preſent at the conſecration of the biſhops of *Carthage*, were highly offended at their being excluded from this ſolemn ceremony, and aſſembling themſelves at *Carthage*, called Cæcilianus before them, to give an account of his conduct. The flame thus kindled, was greatly augmented by certain Carthaginian preſbyters, who were competitors with Cæcilianus, particularly Botrus and Celesius. Lucilla alſo, an opulent lady, who had been reprimanded by Cæcilianus for her ſuperſtitious practices, and had conceived againſt him a bitter enmity on that account, was active in exaſperating the ſpirits of his adverſaries, and diſtributed a large ſum of money among the Numidians to encourage them in their oppoſition to the new biſhop. In conſequence of all this, Cæcilianus, refuſing to ſubmit to the judgment of the Numidians, was condemned in a council, aſſembled by Secundus, biſhop of *Tigiſis*, conſiſting of ſeventy prelates, who, with the conſent of a conſiderable part of the clergy and people, declared him unworthy of the epiſcopal dignity, and choſe his deacon Majorinus for his ſucceſſor. By this proceeding, the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, and groaned under the conteſts of two rival biſhops, Cæcilianus and Majorinus.

Cæcilianus condemned.

The reaſons alleged for his condemnation.

III. The Numidians alleged two important reaſons to juſtify their ſentence againſt Cæcilianus; as *firſt*, that Felix of *Aptungus*, the chief of the biſhops, who aſſiſted at his conſecration, was a *traditor* (*i. e.* one of thoſe, who, during the perſecution under Diocletian, had delivered the ſacred writings and the pious books of the Chriſtians to the magiſtrates in order to be burnt) and that having thus apoſtatized from the ſervice of Christ, it was not poſſible that he could impart the Holy Ghoſt to the new biſhop. A *ſecond* reaſon for their ſentence againſt Cæcilianus was drawn from the harſhneſs and even cruelty that he had diſcovered in his conduct, while he was a deacon, towards the Chriſtian confeſſors and martyrs during the perſecution abovementioned, whom he abandoned, in the moſt mercileſs manner, to all the extremities of hunger and want, leaving them without food in their priſons, and hindering thoſe, who were willing to ſuccour them, from bringing them relief. To theſe accuſations they added, the inſolent contumacy of the new prelate, who refuſed to obey their ſummons, and to appear before them in council to juſtify his conduct.

---

[d] See the law of Theodosius, *Codex Theod.* tom. vi. p. 134, 136, 137, 138.

There was none of the Numidians, who oppoſed CÆCILIANUS with ſuch bitterneſs and vehemence, as DONATUS biſhop of *Caſæ nigræ*, and hence the whole faction was called after him as moſt writers think; though ſome are of opinion, that they derived this name from another DONATUS, whom the Donatiſts ſurnamed the GREAT [e]. This controverſy, in a ſhort time, ſpred far and wide, not only throughout *Numidia*, but even through all the provinces of *Africa*, which entered ſo zealouſly into this eccleſiaſtical war, that in moſt cities there were two biſhops, one at the head of CÆCILIANUS's party, and the other acknowledged by the followers of MAJORINUS.

History of the Donatiſts.

IV. The Donatiſts having brought this controverſy before CONSTANTINE the GREAT, that emperor, in the year 313, appointed MELCHIADES, biſhop of *Rome*, to examine the matter, and named three biſhops of *Gaul* to aſſiſt him in this inquiry. The reſult of this examination was favourable to CÆCILIANUS, who was entirely acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge; but the accuſations that had been brought againſt FELIX of *Aptungus*, by whom he was conſecrated, were left out of the queſtion. Hence it was, that the emperor, in the year 314, ordered the cauſe of FELIX to be examined ſeparately by ÆLIAN, proconſul of *Africa*, by whoſe deciſion he was abſolved. The Donatiſts, whoſe cauſe ſuffered neceſſarily by theſe proceedings, complained much of the judgment pronounced by MELCHIADES and ÆLIAN. The ſmall number of biſhops, that had been appointed to examine their cauſe jointly with MELCHIADES, excited, in a particular manner, their reproaches, and even their contempt. They looked upon the deciſion of ſeventy venerable Numidian prelates, as infinitely more reſpectable than that pronounced by nineteen biſhops (for ſuch was the number aſſembled at [f] *Rome*) who, beſides the inferiority of their number, were not ſufficiently acquainted with the African affairs to be competent judges in the preſent queſtion. The indulgent emperor, willing to remove theſe ſpecious complaints, ordered a ſecond and a much more numerous aſſembly to meet at *Arles* in the year 314, compoſed of biſhops from various provinces, from *Italy*, *Gaul*, *Germany*, and *Spain*. Here again the Donatiſts loſt their cauſe, but renewed their efforts by appealing to the immediate judgment of the emperor, who condeſcended ſo far, as to admit their appeal; and, in conſequence thereof, examined the whole affair himſelf in the year 316 at *Milan*, in preſence of the contending parties. The iſſue of this third trial was not more favourable to the Donatiſts than that of the two preceding councils, whoſe deciſions the emperor confirmed by the ſentence he pronounced [g]. Hence this perverſe ſect loaded CONSTANTINE with the bittereſt reproaches, and maliciouſly complained that OSIUS, biſhop of *Cordoua*, who was honoured with his friendſhip, and was intimately connected with CÆCILIANUS, had, by corrupt inſinuations, engaged him to pronounce an unrighteous ſentence. The emperor, animated with a juſt indignation at ſuch odious proceedings, deprived the Donatiſts of their churches in *Africa*, and ſent into baniſhment their ſeditious biſhops. Nay, he carried his reſentment ſo far as to put ſome of them to death, probably on account of the intolerable petulance and malignity they diſcovered both in their writings and in their diſcourſe. Hence aroſe violent commotions and tumults in *Africa*, as the ſect of the Donatiſts was extremely powerful and numerous there. The emperor endeavoured, by embaſſies and negotiations, to allay theſe diſturbances, but his efforts were without effect.

---

[e] In the faction of the Donatiſts, there were two eminent perſons of the name of DONATUS; the one was a Numidian, and biſhop of *Caſæ nigræ*; the other ſucceeded MAJORINUS, biſhop of *Carthage*, as leader of the Donatiſts, and received from his ſect, on account of his learning and virtue, the title of DONATUS the GREAT. Hence it has been a queſtion among the learned, from which of theſe the ſect derived its name? The arguments that ſupport the different ſides of this trivial queſtion, are nearly of equal force; and why may we not decide it by ſuppoſing that the Donatiſts were ſo called from them both?

[(f) The emperor, in his letter to MELCHIADES, named no more than three prelates. *viz.* MATERNUS, RHETICIUS, and MARINUS, biſhops of *Cologn*, *Autun*, and *Arles*, to ſit with him as judges of this controverſy; but afterwards he ordered ſeven more to be added to the number, and as many as could ſoon and conveniently aſſemble; ſo that they were at laſt nineteen in all.]

The origin of the Circumcelliones.

V. Theſe unhappy commotions gave riſe, no doubt, to that horrible confederacy of deſperate ruffians, who paſſed under the name of Circumcelliones. This furious, fearleſs, and bloody ſet of men, compoſed of the rough and ſavage populace, who embraced the party of the Donatiſts, maintained their cauſe by the force of arms, and, over-running all *Africa*, filled that province with ſlaughter and rapine, and committed the moſt enormous acts of perfidy and cruelty againſt the followers of CÆCILIANUS. This outrageous multitude, whom no proſpect of ſufferings could terrify, and who, upon urgent occaſions, faced death itſelf with the moſt audacious temerity, contributed to render the ſect of the Donatiſts an object of the utmoſt abhorrence; though it cannot be made appear from any records of undoubted authority, that the biſhops of that faction, thoſe, at leaſt, who had any reputation for piety and virtue, either approved the proceedings, or ſtirred up the violence of this odious rabble. In the mean time, the flame of diſcord gathered ſtrength daily, and ſeemed to portend the approaching horrors of a civil war; to prevent which, CONSTANTINE having tried, in vain, every other method of accommodation, aboliſhed, at laſt, by the advice of the governors of *Africa*, the laws that had been enacted againſt the Donatiſts, and allowed the people a full liberty of adhering to the party they liked beſt.

They are defeated.

VI. After the death of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, his ſon CONSTANS, to whom *Africa* fell in the diviſion of the empire, ſent MACARIUS and PAULUS into that province, with a view to heal this deplorable ſchiſm, and to engage the Donatiſts to conclude a peace. DONATUS, ſurnamed the GREAT, the principal biſhop of that ſect, oppoſed all methods of reconciliation with the utmoſt vehemence, and his example was followed by the other prelates of the party. The Circumcelliones alſo continued to ſupport the cauſe of the Donatiſts by aſſaſſinations, and maſſacres executed with the moſt unrelenting fury. They were, however, ſtopt in their career, and were defeated by MACARIUS at the battle of *Bagnia*. Upon this, the affairs of the Donatiſts declined apace; and MACARIUS uſed no longer the ſoft voice of perſuaſion to engage them to an accommodation, but employed his authority for that purpoſe. A few ſubmitted: the greateſt part ſaved themſelves by flight; numbers were ſent into baniſhment, among whom was DONATUS the GREAT; and many of them were puniſhed with the utmoſt ſeverity. During theſe troubles, which continued near thirteen years, ſeveral ſteps were taken againſt the Donatiſts, which the equitable and impartial will be at a loſs to reconcile with the dictates of humanity and juſtice; nor, indeed, do the Catholics themſelves deny the truth of this aſſertion [b]. And hence the complaints which the Donatiſts made of the cruelty of their adverſaries [i].

---

[g] The proofs of the ſupreme power of the emperors, in religious matters, appear ſo inconteſtable in this controverſy, that it is amazing it ſhould ever have been called in queſtion. Certain it is, that, at this time, the notion of a ſupreme judge ſet over the church univerſal by the appointment of CHRIST, never had entered in any one's head. The aſſemblies of the clergy at *Rome* and *Arles*, are commonly called *councils*; but improperly, ſince, in reality, they were nothing more than meetings of judges, or *commiſſaries* appointed by the emperor.

The ſtate of the Donatiſts, under the emperors Julian and Gratian.

VII. The emperor JULIAN, upon his acceſſion to the throne in the year 362, permitted the exiled Donatiſts to return to their country, and reſtore them to the enjoyment of their former liberty. This ſtep renewed the vigour of that expiring ſect, who, on their return from baniſhment, brought over, in a ſhort time, the greateſt part of the province of *Africa* to eſpouſe their intereſts. GRATIAN, indeed, publiſhed ſeveral edicts againſt them, and, in the year 377, deprived them of their churches, and prohibited all their aſſemblies public and private. But the fury of the Circumcelliones, who may be conſidered as the ſoldiery of the Donatiſts, and the apprehenſion of inteſtine tumults prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of thoſe laws. This appears from the number of churches which this people had in *Africa*, towards the concluſion of this century, and which were ſerved by no leſs than four hundred biſhops. Two things, however, diminiſhed conſiderably the power and luſtre of this flouriſhing ſect, and made it decline apace about the end of this century: the one was a violent diviſion that aroſe among them on account of a perſon named MAXIMIN; and this diviſion, ſo proper to weaken the common cauſe, was the moſt effectual inſtrument the Catholics could uſe to combat the Donatiſts. But a ſecond circumſtance which precipitated their decline was the zealous and fervent oppoſition of AUGUSTIN, firſt preſbyter, and afterwards, biſhop of *Hippo*. This learned and ingenious prelate attacked the Donatiſts in every way. In his writings, in his public diſcourſes, and in his private converſations, he expoſed the dangerous and ſeditious principles of this ſect in the ſtrongeſt manner; and as he was of a warm and active ſpirit, he animated againſt them not only the province of *Africa*, but alſo the whole Chriſtian world, and the imperial court.

---

[b] The teſtimony of OPTATUS of *Milevi*, is beyond exception in this matter; it is quoted from the third book of his treatiſe, *De Schiſmate Donatiſtarum*, § 1. and runs thus: “ Ab Operariis Unitatis (*i. e.* the emperor's ambaſſadors MACARIUS and PAULUS) multa quidem aſpere “ geſta ſunt.—Fugerunt omnes Epiſcopi cum clericis ſuis, aliqui ſunt mortui: qui fortiores “ fuerunt, capti et longe relegati ſunt.” OPTATUS, through the whole of this work, endeavours to excuſe the ſeverities committed againſt the Donatiſts, of which he lays the principal fault upon that ſect itſelf, confeſſing, however, that, in ſome inſtances, the proceedings againſt them were too rigorous to deſerve approbation, or admit of an excuſe.

[i] See *Collat. Carthag. diei tertiæ*, § 258. at the end of OPTATUS, p. 315.

The principal crime of the Donatiſts.

VIII. The doctrine of the Donatiſts was conformable to that of the church, as even their adverſaries confeſs; nor were their lives leſs exemplary than thoſe of other Chriſtian ſocieties, if we except the enormous conduct of the Circumcelliones, which the greateſt part of the ſect regarded with the utmoſt deteſtation and abhorrence. The crime, therefore, of the Donatiſts lay properly in the following things; in their declaring the church of *Africa*, which adhered to Cæcilianus, fallen from the dignity and privileges of a true church, and deprived of the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, on account of the offences with which the new biſhop, and Felix of *Aptungus*, who had conſecrated him, were charged; in their pronouncing all the churches, who held communion with that of *Africa*, corrupt and polluted; in maintaining that the ſanctity of their biſhops gave their community alone a full right to be conſidered as the true, the pure, and holy church; and in their avoiding all communication with other churches, from an apprehenſion of contracting their impurity and corruption. This erroneous principle was the ſource of that moſt ſhocking uncharitableneſs and preſumption that appeared in their conduct to other churches. Hence they pronounced the ſacred rites and inſtitutions void of all virtue and efficacy among thoſe Chriſtians who were not preciſely of their ſentiments; and not only rebaptized thoſe who came over to their party from other churches, but even with reſpect to thoſe who had been ordained miniſters of the goſpel; they obſerved the ſevere cuſtom either of depriving them of their office, or obliging them to be ordained a ſecond time. This ſchiſmatic peſtilence was almoſt wholly confined to *Africa:* for the few pitiful aſſemblies, which the Donatiſts had formed in *Spain* and *Italy*, had neither ſtability nor duration [*k*].

The doctrine of this century, concerning the trinity.

IX. The faction of the Donatiſts was not the only one that troubled the church during this century. Soon after its commencement, even in the year 317, a new contention aroſe in *Egypt*, upon a ſubject of much higher importance, and with conſequence of a yet more pernicious nature. The ſubject of this fatal controverſy, which kindled ſuch deplorable diviſions throughout the Chriſtian world, was the doctrine of *three perſons in the God-head*; a doctrine which, in the three preceding centuries, had happily eſcaped the vain curioſity of human reſearches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular ſet of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided againſt the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the *Father* and the *Son*, and that the *Holy Ghoſt* was diſtinct from them both, or, as we commonly ſpeak, that three diſtinct perſons exiſt in the deity; but the mutual relation of theſe perſons to each other, and the nature of that diſtinction that ſubſiſts betwen them, are matters that hitherto were neither diſputed nor explained, and with reſpect to which the church had, conſequently, obſerved a profound ſilence. Nothing was dictated to the faith of Chriſtians in this matter; nor were there any modes of expreſſion preſcribed as requiſite to be uſed in ſpeaking of this myſtery. Hence it happened, that the Chriſtian doctors entertained different ſentiments upon this ſubject without giving the leaſt offence, and diſcourſed variouſly, concerning the diſtinctions between *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; each one following his reſpective opinion with the utmoſt liberty. In *Egypt*, and the adjacent countries, the greateſt part embraced in this, as well as in other matters, the opinion of ORIGEN, who held that the *Son* was, *in God*, that which *reaſon* is *in man*; and that the *Holy Ghoſt* was nothing more than the *divine energy*, or active force. This notion is attended with many difficulties; and if it is not propoſed with the utmoſt caution, tends, in a particular manner, to remove all real diſtinction between the perſons in the God-head, or, in other words, leads directly to Sabellianiſm.

[*k*] A more ample account of the Donatiſts will be found in the following writers: Henr. Valesius, *Diſſert. de Schiſmate Donatiſtarum*. This diſſertation Valesius ſubjoined to his edition of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of Eusebius. Thom. Ittigius's *Hiſtory of Donatiſm*, which is publiſhed in the Appendix to his book concerning the *Hereſies of the apoſtolic age*. Herm. Witsius *Miſcellan. Sacror.* tom. i. lib. iv. p. 742. Henr. Noris. *Hiſt. Donatian.* augmented by the Ballerini Opp. tom. iv. p. xlv. Long's *Hiſtory of the Donatiſts*, London 1677, 8vo. Theſe are the ſources from whence we have drawn the accounts that we have given of this troubleſome ſect.

The riſe of Arianiſm.

X. In an aſſembly of the preſbyters of *Alexandria*, the biſhop of that city, whoſe name was ALEXANDER, expreſſed his ſentiments on this head with a high degree of freedom and confidence; and maintained, among other things, that the ſon was not only of the ſame eminence and dignity, but alſo of the ſame *eſſence* with the father [*l*]. This aſſertion was oppoſed by ARIUS, one of the preſbyters, a man of a ſubtile turn, and remarkable for his eloquence. Whether his zeal for his own opinions, or perſonal reſentment againſt his biſhops was the motive that influenced him, is not very certain. Be that as it will, he firſt treated, as falſe, the aſſertion of ALEXANDER, on account of its affinity to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church; and then running, himſelf, into the oppoſite extreme, he maintained, that the *ſon* was totally and *eſſentially* diſtinct from the *father*; that he was the *firſt* and *nobleſt* of thoſe beings, whom God the *father* had created out of nothing, the inſtrument by whoſe ſubordinate operation the almighty father formed the univerſe, and therefore inferior to the father both in *nature* and in *dignity*. His opinions concerning the *Holy Ghoſt* are not ſo well known. It is, however, certain, that his notion concerning the *ſon of God* was accompanied and connected with other ſentiments, that were very different from thoſe commonly received among Chriſtians, though none of the ancient writers have given us a complete and coherent ſyſtem of thoſe religious tenets, which were really held by ARIUS and his followers [*m*].

[*l*] See SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. v. THEODORET. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. ii.

[*m*] For an account of the Arian controverſy, the curious reader muſt conſult the *Life of Conſtantine*, by EUSEBIUS; the various libels of ATHANASIUS, which are to be found in the fir volume of his works; the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories of* SOCRATES, SOZOMEN, and THEODORET, the 69th *Hereſy of* EPIPHANIUS, and other writers of this and the following age. But amon all theſe, there is none to whom the merit of impartiality can be attributed with juſtice; ſo tha the Arian Hiſtory ſtands yet in need of a pen guided by integrity and candour, and unbiaſſe by affection or hatred. Both ſides have deſerved reproach upon this head: and thoſe who hav hitherto written the hiſtory of the Arian controverſy, have only eſpied the faults of one ſide e. g. It is a common opinion, that ARIUS was too much attached to the opinions of PLAT and ORIGEN (ſee *Petav. Dogm. Theol.* tom. ii. lib. i. cap. viii.) but this common opinion is a vulgar error. ORIGEN and PLATO entertained notions entirely different from thoſe of ARIUS whereas ALEXANDER, his antagoniſt, undoubtedly, followed the manner of ORIGEN, in ex plaining the doctrine of the *three perſons*. See CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem of the Univerſe.*

XI. Th

The progreſs of the Arian ſect.

XI. The opinions of ARIUS were no ſooner divulged, than they found in *Egypt*, and the neighbouring provinces, a multitude of abettors, and among theſe many who were diſtinguiſhed as much by the ſuperiority of their learning and genius, as by the eminence of their rank and ſtation in the world. ALEXANDER, on the other hand, in two councils aſſembled at *Alexandria*, accuſed ARIUS of impiety, and cauſed him to be expelled from the communion of the church. ARIUS received this ſevere and ignominious ſhock with great firmneſs and conſtancy of mind; retired into *Paleſtine*; wrote from thence ſeveral letters to the moſt eminent men of thoſe times, in which he endeavoured to demonſtrate the truth of his opinions, and that with ſuch ſurprizing ſucceſs, that vaſt numbers were drawn over to his party; and among theſe EUSEBIUS, biſhop of *Nicomedia*, a man diſtinguiſhed in the church by his influence and authority. The emperor CONSTANTINE, looking upon the ſubject of this controverſy, as a matter of ſmall importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and eſſential doctrines of religion, contented himſelf at firſt with addreſſing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admoniſhed them to put an end to their diſputes. But when the prince ſaw that his admonitions were without effect, and that the troubles and commotions, which the paſſions of men too often mingle with religious diſputes, were ſpreading and encreaſing daily throughout the empire, he aſſembled, at length, in the year 325, the famous council at *Nice* in *Bithynia*, wherein the deputies of the church univerſal were ſummoned to put an end to this controverſy. In this general council, after many keen debates, and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of ARIUS was condemned; CHRIST declared *conſubſtantial* [n], or, of the ſame eſſence, with the father, the vanquiſhed preſbyter baniſhed among the Illyrians, and his followers compelled to give their aſſent to the creed [o], or confeſſion of faith, which was compoſed by this council.

The council of *Nice*.

XII. The council aſſembled by CONSTANTINE at *Nice*, is one of the moſt famous and intereſting events that are preſented to us in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; and yet, what is moſt ſurprizing, there is no part of the hiſtory of the church that has been unfolded with ſuch negligence, or rather paſſed over with ſuch rapidity [p]. The ancient writers are neither agreed concerning the time nor place in which it was aſſembled, the number of thoſe who ſat in council, nor the biſhop who preſided in it. No authentic acts of its famous ſentence have been committed to writing, or, at leaſt, none have been tranſmitted to our times [q].

---

[n] Ὁμοούσιος.

[o] JOHN CHRIST. SUICER has illuſtrated this famous creed from ſeveral important and ancient records, in a very learned book publiſhed in 4to at *Utrecht*, in the year 1718.

[p] See ITTIGII *Hiſtoria Concilii Nicæni*, which was publiſhed after his death. LE CLERC, *Bibliotheque Hiſtor. et Univerſelle*, tom. x. p. 421. tom. xxii. p. 291. BEAUSOBRE, *Hiſtoire de Manichée, et de Manicheiſme*, tom. i. p. 520. The accounts, which the Oriental writers have given of this council, have been collected by EUSEB. RENAUDOT, in his *Hiſtory of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, p. 69.

[q] See the *Annotations of* VALESIUS *upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* EUSEBIUS, p. 223. JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Bibl. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 195. The hiſtory of this council was written by MARUTHAS, a Syrian, but is long ſince loſt.

The eaſtern Chriſtians differ from all others both concerning the number and the nature of the laws that were enacted in this celebrated council. The latter mention only twenty *canons*; but in the eſtimate of the former, they amount to a much greater number [r]. It appears, however, by thoſe laws, which all parties have admitted as genuine, and alſo from other authentic records, not only that ARIUS was condemned in this council, but that ſome other points were determined, and certain meaſures agreed upon to calm thoſe religious tumults that had ſo long troubled the church. The controverſy, concerning the time of celebrating Eaſter, was terminated [s]; the troubles which NOVATIAN had excited, by oppoſing the re-admiſſion of the *lapſed* to the communion of the church, were compoſed; the Meletian ſchiſm was condemned [t]; the juriſdiction of the greater biſhops preciſely defined and determined [u]; with ſeveral other matters of a like nature. But while theſe good prelates were employing all their zeal and attention to correct the miſtakes and errors of others, they were upon the point of falling into a very capital one themſelves. For they had almoſt come to a reſolution of impoſing upon the clergy the yoke of perpetual celibacy, when PAPHNUTIUS put a ſtop to their proceedings, and warded off that unnatural law [w].

The hiſtory of Arianiſm after the council of *Nice*.

XIII. But notwithſtanding all theſe determinations, the commotions excited by this controverſy remained yet in the minds of many, and the ſpirit of diſſenſion and controverſy triumphed both over the decrees of the council and the authority of the emperor. For thoſe, who, in the main, were far from being attached to the party of ARIUS, found many things reprehenſible both in the decrees of the council, and in the forms of expreſſion which it employed to explain the controverted points; while the Arians, on the other hand, left no means untried to heal their wound, and to recover their place and their credit in the church. And their efforts were crowned with the deſired ſucceſs. For a few years after the council of *Nice*, a certain Arian prieſt, who had been recommended to the emperor, in the dying words of his ſiſter Constantia, found means to perſuade Constantine the Great, that the condemnation of Arius was utterly unjuſt, and was rather owing to the malice of his enemies, than to their zeal for the truth. In conſequence of this, the emperor recalled him from baniſhment in the year 330 [*x*], repealed the laws that had been enacted againſt him, and permitted his chief protector, Eusebius of *Nicomedia*, and his vindictive faction, to vex and oppreſs the partiſans of the *Nicene* council in various ways. Athanasius, biſhop of *Alexandria*, was one of thoſe who ſuffered moſt from the violent meaſures of the Arian party. Invincibly firm in his purpoſe, and deaf to the moſt powerful ſollicitations and entreaties, he obſtinately refuſed to reſtore Arius to his former rank and office. On this account he was depoſed, by the council held at *Tyre*, in the year 335, and was afterwards baniſhed into *Gaul*, while Arius and his followers were, with great ſolemnity, reinſtated in their privileges, and received into the communion of the church. The people of *Alexandria*, unmoved by theſe proceedings in favour of Arius, perſiſted to refuſe him a place among their preſbyters; upon which the emperor invited him to *Conſtantinople* in the year 336, and ordered Alexander, the biſhop of that city, to admit him to his communion. But before this order could be put in execution, Arius died at *Conſtantinople* in a very diſmal manner [*y*], and the emperor Constantine ſurvived him but a ſhort time.

---

[r] TH. ITTIGIUS, *Supplem. opp. Clement. Alex.* p. 191. JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 22. 195. EUSEB. RENAUDOT. *Hiſtor. Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 71.

[(s) The deciſion, with reſpect to Eaſter, was in favour of the cuſtom of the weſtern churches; and accordingly all churches were ordered to celebrate that feſtival on the Sunday which immediately followed the 14th of the firſt moon that happened after the vernal equinox.]

[(t) MELETIUS, biſhop of *Lycopolis* in *Egypt*, was accuſed and convicted of having offered *incenſe* to idols; and, in conſequence thereof, was depoſed by PETER, biſhop of *Alexandria*, whoſe juriſdiction extended throughout all *Egypt*. MELETIUS, upon this, became the head of a ſchiſm in the church, by aſſuming to himſelf the power of ordination, which was veſted in the biſhop of *Alexandria*, and exerciſed by him in all the Egyptian churches. EPIPHANIUS attributes the diſſenſions between MELETIUS and PETER to another cauſe (*Hær.* 68.) he alleges, that the vigorous proceedings of PETER againſt MELETIUS were occaſioned by the latter's refuſing to re-admit into the church thoſe who had fallen from the faith during DIOCLETIAN's perſecution, before their penitential trial was entirely finiſhed. The former opinion is maintained by SOCRATES and THEODORET, whoſe authority is certainly more reſpectable than that of EPIPHANIUS.]

[(u) The confuſion that MELETIUS introduced, by preſuming (as was obſerved in the preceding note) to violate the juriſdiction of PETER, the metropolitan of *Alexandria*, by conferring *ordination* in a province where he alone had a right to ordain, was rectified by the council of *Nice*, who determined, that the metropolitan biſhops, in their reſpective provinces, ſhould have the ſame power and authority that the biſhop of *Rome* exerciſed over the Suburbicarian churches and countries.]

[w] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. i. cap. viii. compared with FRANC. BALDUINUS *in Conſtant. Magn.* and GEORGE CALIXTUS, *De conjugio clericorum*, p. 170.

[(*x*) The preciſe time, in which Arius was recalled from baniſhment, has not been fixed with ſuch perfect certainty, as to prevent a diverſity of ſentiments on that head. The *annotations* of the learned Valesius (or Valois) upon Sozomen's *Hiſtory*, p. 10 and 11, will caſt ſome light upon this matter, and make it probable, that Dr. Mosheim has placed the recall of Arius too late, at leaſt by two years. Valesius has proved, from the authority of Philostorgius, and from other moſt reſpectable monuments and records, that Eusebius of *Nicomedia*, and Theognis, who were baniſhed by the emperor about three months after the council of *Nice*, *i. e.* in the year 325, were recalled in the year 328. Now, in the *writing* by which they obtained their return, they pleaded the reſtoration of Arius as an argument for theirs, which proves that he was recalled before the year 330. The ſame Valesius proves, that Arius, the firſt head of the Arian ſect, was dead before the council of *Tyre*, which was transferred to *Jeruſalem*; and that the letters which Constantine addreſſed to that council in favour of Arius and his followers, were in behalf of a ſecond chief of that name, who put himſelf at the head of the Arians, and who, in conjunction with Euzoius, preſented to Constantine ſuch a confeſſion of their faith, as made him imagine their doctrine to be orthodox, and procured their reconciliation with the church at the council of *Jeruſalem*. See *Annot. Valeſ. ad Hiſt. Socrat.* lib. i. cap. xxxiii. p. 16.]

[(*y*) The diſmal manner in which Arius is ſaid to have expired, by his entrails falling out as he was diſcharging one of the natural functions, is a fact that has been called in queſtion by ſome modern writers, though without foundation, ſince it is confirmed by the unexceptionable teſtimonies of Socrates, Sozomen, Athanasius, and others. The cauſes of this tragical death have, however, furniſhed much matter of diſpute. The ancient writers, who conſidered this event as a judgment of heaven, miraculouſly drawn down, by the prayers of the juſt, to puniſh the impiety of Arius, will find little credit, in our times, among ſuch as have ſtudied with attention and impartiality the hiſtory of Arianiſm. After having conſidered this matter with the utmoſt care, it appears to me extremely probable, that this unhappy man was a victim to the reſentment of his enemies, and was deſtroyed by poiſon, or ſome ſuch violent method. A blind and fanatical zeal for certain ſyſtems of faith, has, in all ages, produced ſuch horrible acts of cruelty and injuſtice.]

Under the ſons of Conſtantine.

XIV. After the death of CONSTANTINE the GREAT, one of his ſons, CONSTANTIUS, who, in the diviſion of the empire, became ruler of the eaſt, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whoſe principles were alſo zealouſly adopted by the empreſs, and, indeed, by the whole court. On the other hand, CONSTANTINE and CONSTANS, emperors of the weſt, maintained the decrees of the council of *Nice* throughout all the provinces, where their juriſdiction extended. Hence aroſe endleſs animoſities and ſeditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injuſtice and violence between the two contending parties. Council was aſſembled againſt council, and their jarring and contradictory decrees ſpred perplexity and confuſion throughout the Chriſtian world.

In the year 350, CONSTANS was aſſaſſinated; and about two years after this, a great part of the weſtern empire, particularly *Rome* and *Italy*, fell into the hands of his brother CONSTANTIUS. This change was extremely unfavourable to thoſe who adhered to the decrees of the council of *Nice*. The emperor's attachment to the Arians animated him againſt their adverſaries, whom he involved in various troubles and calamities, and obliged many of them, by threats and puniſhment, to come over to the ſect which he eſteemed and protected. Among theſe forced proſelytes was LIBERIUS the Roman pontif, who was compelled to embrace Arianiſm in the year 357. The Nicene party meditated repriſals, and waited only a convenient time, a fit place, and a proper occaſion for executing their reſentment. Thus the hiſtory of the church, under the emperor CONSTANTIUS, preſents to the reader a perpetual ſcene of tumult and violence, and the deplorable ſpectacle of a war carried on between brothers, without religion, juſtice, or humanity.

Under Julian and Jovian.

XV. The death of CONSTANTIUS, in the year 362, changed conſiderably the face of religious affairs, and diminiſhed greatly the ſtrength and influence of the Arian party. JULIAN, who by his principles, was naturally prevented from taking a part in the controverſy, beſtowed his protection on neither ſide, but treated them both with an impartiality which was the reſult of a perfect indifference. JOVIAN, his ſucceſſor, declared himſelf in favour of the Nicene doctrine, and immediately the whole weſt, with a conſiderable part of the eaſtern provinces, changed ſides, conformed to the decrees of the council of *Nice*, and abjured the Arian ſyſtem.

Under Valentinian and Valens.

The ſcene, however, changed again in the year 364, when VALENTINIAN, and his brother VALENS, were raiſed to the empire. VALENTINIAN adhered to the decrees of the Nicene council; and hence the whole Arian ſect, a few churches excepted, was deſtroyed and extirpated in the weſt. VALENS, on the other hand, favoured the Arians; and his zeal for their cauſe expoſed their adverſaries the Nicenians, in the eaſtern provinces, to many ſevere trials and ſufferings. Theſe troubles, however, ended with the reign of this emperor, who fell in a battle which was fought againſt the Goths in the year 378, and was ſucceeded by GRATIAN, a friend to the Nicenians, and the reſtorer of their tranquillity. His zeal for their intereſts, though fervent and active, was ſurpaſſed by that of his ſucceſſor, THEODOSIUS the GREAT, who raiſed the ſecular arm againſt the Arians with a terrible degree of violence, drove them from their churches, enacted laws, whoſe ſeverity expoſed them to the greateſt calamities,

calamities [z], and rendered, throughout his dominions, the decrees of the council of *Nice* triumphant over all oppoſition; ſo that the public profeſſion of the Arian doctrine was confined to the barbarous and unconquered nations, ſuch as the Burgundians, Goths, and Vandals.

During this long and violent conteſt between the Nicenians and Arians, the attentive and impartial will acknowledge, that unjuſtifiable meaſures were taken, and great exceſſes committed on both ſides. So that when, abſtracting from the merits of the cauſe, we only conſider with what temper, and by what means, the parties defended their reſpective opinions, it will be difficult to determine which of the two exceeded moſt the bounds of probity, charity, and moderation.

Various ſects of Arians.

XVI. The efforts of the Arians to maintain their cauſe, would have been much more prejudicial to the church than they were in effect, had not the members of that ſect been divided among themſelves, and torn into factions, which regarded each other with the bittereſt averſion. Of theſe, the ancient writers make mention under the names of Semi-arians, Euſebians, Aëtians, Eunomians, Acacians, Pſathyrians, and others: but they may all be ranged with the utmoſt propriety into three claſſes. The firſt of theſe were the primitive and genuine Arians, who rejecting all thoſe forms and modes of expreſſion which the moderns had invented to render their opinions leſs ſhocking to the Nicenians, taught ſimply, "That the ſon *was not begotten of the* "*father* (i. e. produced out of his ſubſtance) *but only created out of nothing*." This claſs was oppoſed by the Semi-arians, who, in their turn, were abandoned by the Eunomians, or Anomæans, the diſciples of ÆTIUS and EUNOMIUS, of whom the latter was eminent for his knowledge and penetration. The Semi-arians held, *that the ſon was* ὁμοιούσιος, i. e. *ſimilar to the father in his eſſence, not by nature, but by a peculiar privilege*; and the leading men of this party were GEORGE of *Laodicea*, and BASILIUS of *Ancyra* [a]. The Eunomians, who were alſo called Aëtians and Exucontians, and may be counted in the number of pure Arians, maintained, that CHRIST was ἑτερούσιος, or ἀνόμοιος, *i. e.* unlike the father as well in his eſſence, as in other reſpects [b]. Under this general diviſion, many other ſubordinate ſects were comprehended, whoſe ſubtilties and refinements have been but obſcurely developed by the ancient writers. The Arian cauſe ſuffered as much from the diſcord and animoſities that reigned among theſe ſects, as from the laboured confutations and the zealous efforts of the orthodox party.

The Apollinarian hereſy.

XVII. The Arian controverſy produced new ſects, occaſioned by the indiſcreet lengths to which the contending parties puſhed their reſpective opinions. And ſuch, indeed, are too generally the unhappy effects of diſputes, in which human paſſions have ſo large a part. Some, while they were careful in avoiding, and zealous in oppoſing, the ſentiments of ARIUS, ran headlong into ſyſtems of doctrine of an equally dangerous and pernicious nature. Others, in defending the Arian notions, went further than their chief, and thus fell into errors much more extravagant than thoſe which he maintained. Thus does it generally happen in religious controverſies: the human mind amidſt its preſent imperfection and infirmity, and its unhappy ſubjection to the empire of imagination and the dictates of ſenſe, rarely follows the middle way in the ſearch of truth, or contemplates ſpiritual and divine things with that accurateneſs and ſimplicity, that integrity and moderation, which alone can guard againſt erroneous extremes.

---

[z] See *Codex Theodoſianus*, tom. vi. p. 5. 10. 130. 146; as alſo GODOFRED's Annotations thereupon.

[a] See PRUD. MARAN's *Diſſert. ſur les Semi-ariens*, of which the learned VOIGT has given a ſecond edition in his *Biblioth. Hæreſiolog.* tom. ii. p. 119.

[b] See BASNAGE's *Diſſert. de Eunomio*, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of CANISIUS, tom. i. p. 172. where we find the *confeſſion* and *apology* of EUNOMIUS yet extant. See alſo JO. ALB. FABRIC. *Bibliotheca Græc.* vol. viii. p. 100—148. and the *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 147. 155. 157. 167. 200, &c.

Among thoſe who fell into ſuch extremes by their inconſiderate violence in oppoſing the Arian ſyſtem, APOLLINARIS the younger, biſhop of *Laodicea*, may be juſtly placed, though otherwiſe a man of diſtinguiſhed merit, and one whoſe learned labours had rendered to religion the moſt important ſervices. He defended ſtrenuouſly the *divinity* of CHRIST againſt the Arians; but, by indulging himſelf too freely in philoſophical diſtinctions and ſubtilties, he was carried ſo far as to deny, in ſome meaſure, his *humanity*. He maintained that the body, which CHRIST aſſumed, was endowed with a *ſenſitive*, and not a *rational* ſoul; and that the divine nature performed the functions of reaſon, and ſupplied the place of what we call the *mind*, the ſpiritual and intellectual principle in man. And from this it ſeemed to follow, as a natural conſequence, that the *divine nature* in CHRIST was blended with the *human*, and ſuffered with it the pains of crucifixion and death itſelf [*c*]. This great man was led aſtray, not only by his love of diſputing, but alſo by an immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine, concerning the two-fold nature of the ſoul, which was too generally adopted by the divines of this age; and which, undoubtedly, perverted their judgment in ſeveral reſpects, and led them to erroneous and extravagant deciſions on various ſubjects.

Other errors, beſide that now mentioned, are imputed to APOLLINARIS by certain ancient writers; but it is not eaſy to determine how far they deſerve credit upon that head [*d*]. Be that as it will, his doctrine was received by great numbers in almoſt all the eaſtern provinces, though, by the different explications that were given of it, its votaries were ſubdivided into various ſects. It did not, however, maintain its ground long; but being attacked, at the ſame time, by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the learned, it ſunk, by degrees, under their united force.

[(*c*) However erroneous the hypotheſis of APOLLINARIS may have been, the conſequences here drawn from it, are not entirely juſt; for if it is true, that the human ſoul does not, in any reſpect, ſuffer death by the diſſolution of the body, the ſame muſt hold good with reſpect to the divine nature.]

[*d*] See BASNAGE's *Hiſtoria Hæreſis Apollinaris*, publiſhed a ſecond time by VOIGT, in his *Bibliotheca Hæreſiologica*, tom. i. faſcic. i. p. 1—96, and improved by ſome learned and important additions. See alſo tom. i. faſcic. iii. and p. 607. of this latter work. The laws that were enacted againſt the followers of APOLLINARIS, are extant in the *Theodoſian Code*, tom. vi. p. 144. See an account of APOLLINARIS, and his *Hereſy*, in the Engliſh edition of BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article APOLLINARIS.

Marcellus of Ancyra.

XVIII. MARCELLUS, biſhop of *Ancyra* in *Galatia*, may be ranked in the ſame claſs with APOLLINARIS, if we are to give credit to EUSEBIUS of *Cæſarea*, and the reſt of his adverſaries, who repreſent his explication of the doctrine of the trinity as bordering upon the Sabellian and Samoſatenian errors. Many, however, are of opinion, that EUSEBIUS of *Cæſarea*, and the biſhop of *Nicomedia*, who bore the ſame name, repreſented with partiality the ſentiments of MARCELLUS, on account of the bitterneſs and vehemence which he diſcovered in his oppoſition to the Arians, and their protectors. But though it ſhould be acknowledged, that, in ſome particulars, the accuſations of his enemies carried an aſpect of partiality and reſentment, yet it is manifeſt, that they were far from being entirely groundleſs. For, if the doctrine of MARCELLUS be attentively examined, it will appear, that he conſidered the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt* as *two emanations* from the divine nature, which, after performing their reſpective offices, were to return again into the *ſubſtance* of the father; and every one will perceive, at firſt ſight, how incompatible this opinion is with the belief of *three diſtinct perſons in the God-head*. Beſides this, a particular circumſtance which augmented conſiderably the averſion of many to MARCELLUS, as alſo the ſuſpicion of his erring in a capital manner, was his obſtinately refuſing, towards the concluſion of his life, to condemn the tenets of his diſciple PHOTINUS [e].

The ſect of Photinus.

XIX. PHOTINUS, biſhop of *Sirmium*, may, with propriety, be placed at the head of thoſe whom the Arian controverſy was the occaſion of ſeducing into the moſt extravagant errors. This prelate publiſhed, in the year 343, his opinions concerning the deity, which were equally repugnant to the Orthodox and Arian ſyſtems. His notions, which have been but obſcurely, and indeed ſometimes inconſiſtently repreſented by the ancient writers, amount to this, when attentively examined: "That JESUS CHRIST was born of the "HOLY GHOST and the Virgin MARY; that a certain *divine emanation*, or ray "(which he called the *word*) deſcended upon this extraordinay man; that, "on account of the union of the *divine word* with his *human nature*, JESUS "was called the *Son of God*, nay, *God* himſelf; and that the *Holy Ghoſt* was "not a diſtinct *perſon*, but a celeſtial *virtue* proceeding from the deity." The emerity of this bold innovator was chaſtiſed, not only by the orthodox in he councils of *Antioch* [*f*] and *Milan*, held in the years 345 and 347, and in hat of *Sirmium*, whoſe date is uncertain, but alſo by the Arians in one of heir aſſemblies held at *Sirmium*, in the year 351. In conſequence of all this, PHOTINUS was degraded from the epiſcopal dignity, and died in exile in the ear 372 [g] [g].

---

[e] See MONTFAUCON's *Diatriba de Cauſſa Marcelli in Nova Collectione Patrum Græcorum*, m. ii. p. 51; as alſo GERVAISE, *Vie de S. Epiphane*, p. 42.

[f] According to Dr. LARDNER's account, this council of *Antioch*, in 345, was held by the rians on Euſebians, and not by the Orthodox as our author affirms. See LARDNER's *Credi*ity, &c. vol. ix. p. 13; ſee alſo ATHANAS. *De Synod. N.* vi, vii. compared with SOCRAT. ii. cap. xviii, xix.]

[g] Or in 375, as is concluded from JEROME's *Chronicle*.

[g] MATT. LARROGUE, *De Photino, et ejus multiplici condemnatione*. THOM. ITTIGIUS, *ſtoria Photini in App. ad librum de Hæreſiarchis ævi Apoſtolici*.

XX. After

The hereſy of Macedonius.

XX. After him aroſe MACEDONIUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, a very eminent Semi-arian doctor, who, through the influence of the Eunomians, was depoſed by the council of *Conſtantinople*, in the year 360, and ſent into exile, where he formed the ſect of the Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians. In his exile, he declared with the utmoſt freedom thoſe ſentiments which he had formerly either concealed, or, at leaſt, taught with much circumſpection. He conſidered the *Holy Ghoſt* as "a *divine energy* diffuſed throughout the univerſe, "and not as a *perſon* diſtinct from the *Father* and the *Son* [h]." This opinion had many partiſans in the Aſiatic provinces; but the council aſſembled, by THEODOSIUS, in the year 381, at *Conſtantinople* (to which the ſecond rank among the *œcumenical*, or general councils is commonly attributed) put a ſtop by its authority to the growing evil, and cruſhed this riſing ſect before it had arrived at its full maturity. An hundred and fifty biſhops, who were preſent at this council, gave the finiſhing touch to what the council of *Nice* had left imperfect, and fixed, in a full and determinate manner, the doctrine of *three* PERSONS *in one* GOD, which is as yet received among the generality of Chriſtians. This venerable aſſembly did not ſtop here; they branded, with infamy, all the errors, and ſet a mark of execration upon all the hereſies that were hitherto known; they advanced the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, on account of the eminence and extent of the city in which he reſided, to the firſt rank after the Roman pontif, and determined ſeveral other points, which they looked upon as eſſential to the well-being of the church in general [i].

The Priſcillianiſts.

XXI. The frenzy of the ancient Gnoſtics, which had been ſo often vanquiſhed, and, in appearance, removed by the various remedies that had been uſed for that purpoſe, broke out a new in *Spain*. It was tranſported thither, in the beginning of this century, by a certain perſon named MARK of *Memphis*, in *Egypt*, whoſe converts at firſt were not very numerous. They increaſed, however, in proceſs of time, and counted in their number ſeveral perſons highly eminent for their learning and piety. Among others, PRISCILLIAN, a layman, diſtinguiſhed by his birth, fortune, and eloquence, and afterwards biſhop of *Abila*, was infected with this odious doctrine, and became its moſt zealous and ardent defender. Hence he was accuſed by ſeveral biſhops, and, by a reſcript obtained from the emperor GRATIAN, he was baniſhed with his followers from *Spain* [k], but was reſtored, ſome time after by an edict of the ſame prince, to his country and his functions. His ſufferings did not end here; for he was accuſed a ſecond time, in the year 384 [l], before MAXIMUS, who had procured the aſſaſſination of GRATIAN, and made himſelf maſter of *Gaul*; and, by the order of that prince, was put to death, at *Treves*, with ſome of his aſſociates. The agents, however, by whoſe barbarous zeal this ſentence was obtained, were juſtly regarded with the utmoſt abhorrence by the biſhops of *Gaul* and *Italy* [m]; for Chriſtians had not yet learned, that giving over heretics to be puniſhed by the magiſtrate, was either an act of piety or juſtice [n]; no: [This abominable doctrine was reſerved for thoſe times, when religion was to become an inſtrument of deſpotiſm, or a pretext for the exerciſe of malevolence, vengeance, and pride.]

---

[h] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. iv. cap. iv.

[i] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. v. cap. viii. p. 264. SOZOMEN. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. vii. p. 711.

[(k) This baniſhment was the effect of a ſentence pronounced againſt PRISCILLIAN, and ſome of his followers, by a ſynod convened at *Saragoſſa* in the year 380; in conſequence of which, IDACIUS and ITHACIUS, two cruel and perſecuting eccleſiaſtics, obtained from GRATIAN the reſcript abovementioned. See SULPIC. SEVER. *Hiſt. Sacr.* lib. ii. cap. xlvii. p. 283. edit. Leipſick, 8vo.]

[(l) Upon the death of GRATIAN, who had favoured PRISCILLIAN towards the latter end of his reign, ITHACIUS preſented to MAXIMUS a petition againſt him; whereupon this prince appointed a *council* to be held at *Bourdeaux*, from which PRISCILLIAN appealed to the prince himſelf. SULP. SEVER. lib. ii. cap. xlix. p. 287.]

The death of PRISCILLIAN was leſs pernicious to the progreſs of his opinions, than might naturally have been expected. His doctrine not only ſurvived him, but was propagated through the greateſt part of *Spain* and *Gaul*. And, even ſo far down as the ſixth century, the followers of this unhappy man gave much trouble to the biſhops and clergy in thoſe provinces.

Their doctrine.

XXII. None of the ancient writers have given an accurate account of the doctrine of the Priſcillianiſts. Many, on the contrary, by their injudicious repreſentations of it, have highly disfigured it, and added new degrees of obſcurity to a ſyſtem which was before ſufficiently dark and perplexed. It appears, however, from authentic records, that the difference between their doctrine, and that of the Manicheans, was not very conſiderable. For "they denied "the *reality* of CHRIST's birth and incarnation; maintained, that the viſible "univerſe was not the production of the ſupreme deity, but of ſome *dæmon*, or "malignant principle; adopted the doctrine of *æons*, or emanations, from the "divine nature; conſidered human bodies as priſons formed, by the author "of evil, to enſlave celeſtial minds; condemned marriage, and diſbelieved the "reſurrection of the body." Their rule of life and manners was rigid and ſevere; and the accounts which many have given of their laſciviouſneſs and intemperance deſerve not the leaſt credit, as they are totally deſtitute of evidence and authority. That the Priſcillianiſts were guilty of diſſimulation upon ſome occaſions, and deceived their adverſaries by cunning ſtratagems, is true: but that they held it as a maxim, that lying and perjury were *lawful*, is a moſt notorious falſhood, without even the leaſt ſhadow of probability [o], however commonly this odious doctrine has been laid to their charge. In the heat of controverſy, the eye of paſſion and prejudice is too apt to confound the principles and opinions of men with their practice.

---

[m] [It may be intereſting to the reader, to hear the character of the firſt perſon that introduced *civil* perſecution into the Chriſtian church. "He was a man abandoned to the moſt "corrupt indolence, and without the leaſt tincture of true piety. He was audacious, talkative, "impudent, luxurious, and a ſlave to his belly. He accuſed as heretics and as protectors of PRISCILLIAN, all thoſe whoſe lives were conſecrated to the purſuit of piety and knowledge, or "diſtinguiſhed by acts of mortification and abſtinence, *&c.*" Such is the character which SULPICIUS SEVERUS, who had an extreme averſion to the ſentiments of PRISCILLIAN, gives us of ITHACIUS biſhop of *Soſſuba*, by whoſe means he was put to death.]

[n] See SULP. SEVER. *Hiſt. Sacr.* edit. Leipſ. 8vo, 1709. where MARTIN, the truly apoſtolical biſhop of *Tours*, ſays to MAXIMUS, *Novum eſſe et inauditum nefas ut cauſam eccleſiæ judex ſeculi judicaret.* See alſo *Dial.* iii. *de vita Martini*, cap. xi. p. 495.

[o] See SIMON DE URIES, *Diſſert. Critica de Priſcillianiſtis*, printed at *Utrecht* in the year 1745, in 4to. The only defect in this diſſertation is the implicit manner in which the author follows BEAUSOBRE's *Hiſtory of the Manicheans*, taking every thing for granted which is affirmed in that work. See all FRANC. GIRVESII *Hiſtoria Priſcillianiſtarum Chronologica*, publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1750, in 8vo. We find, moreover, in the twenty-ſeventh volume of the *Opuſculum Scientificum* of ANGELUS CALOGERA, a treatiſe intitled, *Bachiarus Illuſtratus, ſeu*

Inferior ſects.

XXIII. To what we have here ſaid concerning thoſe famous ſects which made a noiſe in the world, it will not be improper to add ſome account of thoſe of a leſs conſiderable and inferior kind.

Audæus.

AUDÆUS, a man of remarkable virtue, being excommunicated in *Syria*, on account of the freedom and importunity with which he cenſured the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy, formed an aſſembly of thoſe who were attached to him, and became, by his own appointment, their biſhop. Baniſhed into *Scythia* by the emperor, he went among the Goths, where his ſect flouriſhed and augmented conſiderably. The ancient writers are not agreed about the time in which we are to date the origin of this ſect. With reſpect to its religious inſtitutions, we know that they differed in ſome points from thoſe obſerved by other Chriſtians: and particularly, that the followers of AUDÆUS celebrated Eaſter, or the Paſchal feaſt, with the Jews, contrary to the expreſs decree of the council of *Nice*. With reſpect to their doctrine, ſeveral errors have been imputed to them [*p*], and this, among others, that they attributed to the deity a human form.

Meſſalians, or Euchites.

XXIV. The Grecian and Oriental writers place, in this century, the riſe of the ſect of the Meſſalians, or Euchites, whoſe doctrine and diſcipline were, indeed, much more ancient, and ſubſiſted, even before the birth of CHRIST, in *Syria*, *Egypt*, and other eaſtern countries; but who do not ſeem to have been formed into a religious body before the latter end of the age of which we now write. Theſe fanatics, who lived after the monkiſh faſhion, and withdrew from all commerce and ſociety with their fellow-creatures, ſeem to have derived their name from their habit of continual *prayer*. "They imagined, that the mind of every man was inhabited by an *evil dæmon*, whom it was impoſſible to expel by any other means, than by conſtant prayer and ſinging of hymns: and that when this malignant ſpirit was caſt out, the *pure mind* returned to God, and was again united to the *divine eſſence* from whence it had been ſeparated." To this leading tenet they added many other enormous opinions, which bear a manifeſt reſemblance of the Manichean doctrine, and are evidently drawn from the ſame ſource from whence the Manicheans derived their errors, even from the tenets of the Oriental philoſophy [*q*]. In a word: the Euchites were a ſort of Myſtics, who imagined, according to the Oriental notion, that two ſouls reſided in man, the one *good*, and the other *evil*; and who were zealous in haſtening the return of the good

---

de Priſcilliana Hæreſi diſſertatio; but this diſſertation appears rather intended to clear up the affair of *Bachiarius*, than to give a full account of the Priſcillianiſts and their doctrine.

[*p*] EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreſ.* lxx. p. 811. AUGUSTIN. *De Hæreſ.* cap. l. THEODORET. *Fabul. Hæret.* lib. iv. cap. ix. p. 671. JO. JOACH. SCHRODER. *Diſſertat. de Audæanis*, publiſhed in VOIGT's *Bibliotheca Hiſtoriæ Hæreſiolog.* tom. i. part. III. p. 578.

[*q*] EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreſ.* lxxx. p. 1067. THEODORET. *Hæret. Fabul.* lib. iv. cap. x. p. 672. TIMOTHEUS, *Preſbyter de receptione Hæreticor.* publiſhed in the third volume of COTELERIUS's *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, p. 403. JAC. TOLLII *Inſignia itineris Italici*, p. 110. ASSEMANI *Bibliotheca Orientalis Vaticana*, tom. i. p. 128. tom. iii. part. II. p. 172, &c.

ſpirit to God, by contemplation and prayer. The external air of piety and devotion which accompanied this ſect, impoſed upon many: while the Greeks, on the other hand, oppoſed it with vehemence in all ſucceeding ages.

It is proper to obſerve here, that the title of Meſſalians and Euchites had a very extenſive application among the Greeks and the Orientals, who gave it to all thoſe who endeavoured to raiſe the ſoul to God by recalling and withdrawing it from all terreſtrial and ſenſible objects; however theſe enthuſiaſts might differ from each other in their opinions on other ſubjects.

The Antidico-marianites and the Collyridians.

XXV. Towards the concluſion of this century, two oppoſite ſects involved *Arabia*, and the adjacent countries, in the troubles and tumults of a new controverſy. Theſe jarring factions went by the names of Antidico-marianites and Collyridians. The former maintained, that the Virgin Mary did not always preſerve her immaculate ſtate, but received the embraces of her huſband Joseph after the birth of Christ. The latter on the contrary, who were ſingularly favoured by the female ſex, running into the oppoſite extreme, worſhiped the Bleſſed Virgin, as a goddeſs, and judged it neceſſary to appeaſe her anger, and ſeek her favour and protection by libations, ſacrifices and oblations of *cakes* (*collyridæ*) and ſuch like ſervices [r].

Other ſects might be mentioned here, but they are too obſcure and inconſiderable to deſerve notice.

---

[r] See Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* lxxviii, lxxix. p. 1003 and 1057.

THE FIFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church.

The ſtate of the Roman empire.

I. IN order to arrive at a true knowlege of the cauſes, to which we are to attribute the outward ſtate of the church, and the events which happened to it during this century, we muſt keep in view the civil hiſtory of this period of time. It is, therefore, proper to obſerve, that, in the beginning of this century, the Roman empire was divided into two diſtinct ſovereignties, of which the one comprehended the eaſtern provinces, the other, thoſe of the weſt. ARCADIUS, the emperor of the eaſt, reigned at *Conſtantinople*; and HONORIUS, who governed the weſtern provinces, choſe *Ravenna* for the place of his reſidence. This latter prince, remarkable only for the ſweetneſs of his temper, and the goodneſs of his heart, neglected the great affairs of the empire, and, inattentive to the weighty duties of his ſtation, held the reins of government with an unſteddy hand. The Goths took advantage of this criminal indolence; made incurſions into *Italy*; laid waſte its faireſt provinces; and ſometimes carried their deſolations as far as *Rome*, which they ravaged and plundered in the moſt dreadful manner. Theſe calamities, which fell upon the weſtern part of the empire from the Gothic depredations, were followed by others ſtill more dreadful under the ſucceeding emperors. A fierce and warlike people, iſſuing out of *Germany*, overſpred *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Spain*, the nobleſt of all the European provinces, and erected new kingdoms in thoſe fertile countries; and ODOACER, at laſt, at the head of the Heruli, having conquered AUGUSTULUS, in the year 476, gave the mortal blow to the weſtern empire, and reduced all *Italy* under his dominion. About ſixteen years after this, THEODORIC, king of the Oſtrogoths, made war upon theſe Barbarian invaders, at the requeſt of ZENO, emperor of the eaſt; conquered ODOACER in ſeveral battles, and obtained, as the fruits of his victories,

ries, a kingdom for the Oſtrogoths in *Italy*, which ſubſiſted under various turns of fortune from the year 493 to 552 [*a*].

Theſe new monarchs of the weſt pretended to acknowledge the ſupremacy of the emperors who reſided at *Conſtantinople*, and gave ſome faint external marks of a diſpoſition to reign in ſubordination to them; but in reality, they ruled with an abſolute independence, in their reſpective governments, and, as appears particularly by the dominion exerciſed by THEODORIC in *Italy*, left nothing remaining to the eaſtern emperors but a mere ſhadow of power and authority [*b*].

The futher decline of idolatry.

II. Theſe conſtant wars, and the inexpreſſible calamities with which they were attended, were undoubtedly detrimental to the cauſe and progreſs of Chriſtianity. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the Chriſtian emperors, eſpecially thoſe who ruled in the eaſt, were active and aſſiduous in extirpating the remains of the ancient ſuperſtitions. THEODOSIUS the younger, diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this pious and noble work, and many remarkable monuments of his zeal in this matter are ſtill preſerved [*c*]; ſuch as the laws which enjoined either the deſtruction of the heathen temples, or the dedication of them to CHRIST and his ſaints; the edicts by which he abrogated the ſacrilegious rites and ceremonies of Paganiſm; and removed from all offices and employments in the ſtate ſuch as perſevered in their attachment to the abſurdities of Polytheiſm.

This ſpirit of reformation appeared with leſs vigour in the weſtern empire. There the feaſts of Saturn and Pan, the combats of the gladiators and other rites that were inſtituted in honour of the Pagan deities, were celebrated with the utmoſt freedom and impunity; and perſons of the higheſt rank and authority profeſſed publicly the religion of their idolatrous anceſtors [*d*]. This liberty was, however, from time to time reduced within narrower limits, and all thoſe public ſports and feſtivals; that were more peculiarly incompatible with the genius and ſanctity of the Chriſtian religion, were every where aboliſhed [*e*].

Nations converted to Chriſtianity.

III. The limits of the church continued to extend themſelves, and gained ground daily upon the idolatrous nations both in the eaſtern and weſtern empires. In the eaſt, the inhabitants of mount *Libanus* and *Antilibanus* being dreadfully infeſted with wild beaſts, implored the aſſiſtance and counſels of the famous SIMEON the Stylite, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter. SIMEON gave them for anſwer, that the only effectual method of removing this calamity, was to abandon the ſuperſtitious worſhip of their anceſtors, and ſubſtitute the Chriſtian religion in its place. The docility of this people, joined to the extremities to which they were reduced, engaged them to follow the counſels of this holy man. They embraced Chriſtianity, and, in conſequence of their converſion, they had the pleaſure of ſeeing their ſavage enemies abandon their habitations; if we may believe the writers who affirm the truth of this prodigy. The ſame SIMEON, by his influence and authority, introduced the Chriſtian worſhip into a certain diſtrict of the Arabians; ſome allege, that this alſo was effected by a miracle, which to me appears ſomewhat more than doubtful [*f*]. To theſe inſtances of the progreſs of the goſpel, we may add the converſion of a conſiderable number of Jews in the iſle of *Crete*, who, finding themſelves groſly deluded by the impious pretenſions of an impoſtor, called MOSES CRETENSIS [*g*], who gave himſelf out for the MESSIAH, opened their eyes upon the truth, and embraced the Chriſtian religion of their own accord [*h*].

[*a*] See, for a fuller illuſtration of this branch of hiſtory, the learned work of DE BOS, intitled, *Hiſtoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoiſe*, tom. i. p. 258; as alſo MASCOW's *Hiſtory of the Germans*.

[*b*] CAR. DU FRESNE, *Diſſert*. xxiii. *ad Hiſtor. Ludovici S*. p. 280. MURATORII *Antiq. Ital*. tom. ii. p. 578. 832. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 207. JO. COCHLAEI *Vita Theodorici Oſtrogothorum regis*, printed in 4to in the year 1699, with the obſervations and remarks of PERINGSKIOLD.

[*c*] See the *Theodoſian Code*, tom. vi. p. 327.

[*d*] See the *Saturnalia* of MACROBIUS, lib. i. p. 190. edit. Gronov. SCIPIO MAFFEI *delli Anfiteatri*, lib. i. p. 56, 57. PIERRE LE BRUN, *Hiſt. Critique des pratiques ſuperſtieuſes*, tom. i. p. 237. And above all MONTFAUCON, *Diſſ. de moribus tempore Theodoſii M. et Arcadii*, which is to be found in Latin, in the eleventh volume of the works of St. CHRYSOSTOM, and in French, in the twentieth volume of the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, p. 197.

[*e*] ANASTASIUS prohibited, towards the concluſion of this century, the combats with the wild beaſts, and other ſhews. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic*. tom. i. p. 246.

The converſion of the German nations to Chriſtianity.

IV. The German nations, who rent in pieces the Roman empire in the weſt, were not all converted to Chriſtianity at the ſame time. Some of them had embraced the truth before the time of their incurſion; and ſuch, among others, was the caſe of the Goths. Others, after having erected their little kingdoms in the empire, embraced the goſpel, that they might thus live with more ſecurity amidſt a people, who, in general, profeſſed the Chriſtian religion. It is, however, uncertain (and likely to continue ſo) at what time, and by whoſe miniſtry, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans were converted to Chriſtianity. With reſpect to the Burgundians, who inhabited the banks of the *Rhine*, and who paſſed from thence into *Gaul*, we are informed, by SOCRATES [*i*], that they embraced the goſpel of their own accord from a notion that CHRIST, or the God of the Romans, who had been repreſented to them as a moſt powerful being, would defend them againſt the rapines and incurſions of the Hunns. They afterwards ſided with the Arian party, to which alſo the Vandals, Sueves, and Goths were zealouſly attached. All theſe fierce and warlike nations judged a religion excellent, in proportion to the ſucceſs which crowned the arms of thoſe that profeſſed it, and eſteemed, conſequently, that doctrine the beſt, whoſe profeſſors had gained the greateſt number of victories. When therefore they ſaw the Romans poſſeſſed of an empire much more extenſive than that of any other people, they concluded that Christ, their God, was of all others the moſt worthy of religious homage.

[*f*] ASSEMANNI, *Bibl. Orient. Vat.* tom. i. p. 246.

[*g*] We ſhall give the relation of SOCRATES, concerning this impoſtor, in the words of the learned and eſtimable author of the *Remarks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*. "In the time of THEODOSIUS the younger an impoſtor aroſe, called MOSES CRETENSIS. He pretended to be a "ſecond MOSES, ſent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in *Crete*, and promiſed to divide the ſea, "and give them a ſafe paſſage through it. They aſſembled together, with their wives and "children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to caſt themſelves "into the ſea. Many of them obeyed and periſhed in the waters, and many were taken up and "ſaved by fiſhermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impoſtor to pieces; "but he eſcaped them, and was ſeen no more. See JORTIN's *Remarks*, &c. vol. iii. p. 331.]

[*h*] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xxxviii. p. 383.

[*i*] Idem, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. vii. cap. xxx. p. 371.

Of the Franks.

V. It was the ſame principle and the ſame views that engaged Clovis [k], king of the *Salii*, a nation of the Franks, to embrace Chriſtianity. This prince, whoſe ſignal valour was accompanied with barbarity, arrogance, and injuſtice, founded the kingdom of the Franks in *Gaul*, after having made himſelf maſter of a great part of that country, and meditated with a ſingular eagerneſs and avidity the conqueſt of the whole. His converſion to the Chriſtian religion, is dated from the battle he fought with the Alemans in the year 496, at a village called *Tolbiacum* [l]; in which, when the Franks began to give ground, and their affairs ſeemed deſperate, he implored the aſſiſtance of Christ (whom his queen Clothildis, daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had often repreſented to him, in vain, as the *ſon* of the *true God)* and ſolemnly engaged himſelf, by a vow, to worſhip him as his God, if he rendered him victorious over his enemies. Victory decided in favour of the Franks; and Clovis, faithful to his engagement, received baptiſm at *Rheims* [m], towards the concluſion of that ſame year, after having been inſtructed by Remigius, biſhop of that city, in the doctrines of the goſpel [n]. The example of the king had ſuch a powerful effect upon the minds of his ſubjects, that three thouſand of them immediately followed it, and were baptized with him. Many are of opinion, that the deſire of extending his dominions was that which contributed principally to render Clovis faithful to his engagement; though ſome influence may alſo be allowed to the zeal and exhortations of his queen Clothildis. Be that as it will, nothing is more certain than that his profeſſion of Chriſtianity was, in effect, of great uſe to him, both in confirming and enlarging his empire.

The miracles, which are ſaid to have been wrought at the baptiſm of Clovis, are utterly unworthy of the ſmalleſt degree of credit. Among others the principal prodigy, that of the phial full of oil ſaid to be brought from heaven by a milk-white dove, during the ceremony of baptiſm, is either a fiction, or rather, perhaps, an impoſture; a pretended miracle contrived by artifice and fraud [o]. Pious frauds of this nature were very commonly practiſed in *Gaul* and in *Spain* at this time, in order to captivate, with more facility, the minds of a rude and barbarous people, who were ſcarcely ſuſceptible of a rational conviction.

---

[k] Beſides the name of Clovis, this prince was alſo called Clodovæus, Hludovicus, Ludovicus, and Ludicin.

[l] *Tolbiacum* is thought to be the preſent *Zulpick*, which is about twelve miles from *Cologn*.]

[m] See Gregory of *Tours*, *Hiſtoria Francorum*, lib. ii. cap. xxx, xxxi. Henry Count Bunau's *Hiſtoria Imperii Romano-Germanici*, tom. i. p. 588. De Bos's *Hiſtoire Critique de la Monarchie Françoiſe*, tom ii. p. 340.]

[n] The Epitomizer of the hiſtory of the Franks tells us, that Remigius having preached to Clovis, and thoſe who had been baptized with him, a ſermon on the paſſion of our Saviour; the king, in hearing him, could not forbear crying out, "If I had been there with my Franks, "that ſhould not have happened."]

[o] The truth of this miracle has been denied by the learned John James Chiflet, in his book *de Ampulla Rhemenſi*, printed in folio, at *Antwerp*, in the year 1651; and it has been affirmed by Vertot, in the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptiones et des Belles Lettres*, tom. iv. p. 350. After a mature conſideration of what has been alleged on both ſides of the queſtion, I can ſcarcely venture to deny the fact: I am therefore of opinion, that, in order to confirm and

The converſion of CLOVIS is looked upon by the learned as the origin of the titles of *Moſt Chriſtian king*, and *eldeſt ſon of the church*, which have been ſo long attributed to the kings of *France* [p]. For if we except this prince, all the kings of thoſe barbarous nations, who ſeized upon the Roman provinces, were either yet involved in the darkneſs of paganiſm, or infected with the Arian hereſy.

Of the Iriſh.

VI. CELESTINE, the Roman pontif, ſent PALLADIUS into *Ireland* to propagate the Chriſtian religion among the rude inhabitants of that iſland. This firſt miſſion [q] was not attended with much fruits; nor did the ſucceſs of PALLADIUS bear any proportion to his laborious and pious endeavours. After his death, the ſame pontif employed, in this miſſion, SUCCATHUS, a native of *Scotland*, whoſe name he changed into that of PATRICK, and who arrived among the Iriſh in the year 432. The ſucceſs of his miniſtry, and the number and importance of his pious exploits, ſtand upon record as undoubted proofs not only of his reſolution and patience, but alſo of his dexterity and addreſs. Having attacked, with much more ſucceſs than his predeceſſor, the errors and ſuperſtitions of that uncivilized people, and brought great numbers of them over to the Chriſtian religion; he founded, in the year 472, the archbiſhopric of *Armagh* [r], which has ever ſince remained the metropolitan ſee of the Iriſh nation. Hence this famous miſſionary, though not the firſt who brought among that people the light of the goſpel, has yet been juſtly intitled, *The apoſtle of the Iriſh*, and the father of the Hibernian

---

fix the wavering faith of this Barbarian prince, REMIGIUS had prepared his meaſures before hand, and trained a pigeon by vaſt application and dexterity in ſuch a manner, that, during the baptiſm of CLOVIS, it deſcended from the roof of the church with a phial of oil. Among the records of this century, we find accounts of many ſuch miracles. [There is one circumſtance which obliges me to differ from Dr. MOSHEIM upon this point, and to look upon the ſtory of the famous phial, rather as a *mere fiction*, than as *a pious fraud* or pretended miracle brought about by artifice; and that circumſtance is, that GREGORY of *Tours*, from whom we have a full account of the converſion and baptiſm of CLOVIS, and who, from his proximity to this time may almoſt be called a contemporary writer, has not made the leaſt mention of this famous miracle. This omiſſion, in a writer whom the Roman catholics themſelves conſider as an over-credulous hiſtorian, amounts to a proof, that, in his time, this fable was not yet invented.]

[p] See GAB. DANIEL et DE CAMPS, *Diſſert. de titulo Regis Chriſtianiſſimi*, *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1720, p. 243. 404. 448. 336. *Memoires de l'Academic des Inſcriptions*, tom. xx. p. 466.

[(q) From the *fragments* of the lives of ſome Iriſh biſhops. who are ſaid to have converted many of their countrymen in the fourth century, archbiſhop USHER concludes, that PALLADIUS was not the firſt biſhop of Ireland. (See his *Antiquities of the Britiſh Church.*) But it has been evidently proved, and among others by BOLLANDUS, that theſe *fragments* are of no earlier date than the twelfth century, and are, beſides, the moſt of them fabulous. Dr. MOSHEIM's opinion is further confirmed by the authority of PROSPER, which is deciſive in this matter.]

[r] See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. Martii, p. 517. tom. iii. Februar. p. 131. 179. JAC. WARAEI *Hibernia Sacra*, printed in folio at *Dublin*, 1717. This latter publiſhed at *London*, in 1656, in 8vo, *the Works of St.* PATRICK. The ſynods, that were held by this eminent miſſionary, are to be found in WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hiberniæ*, tom. i. p. 2. With reſpect to the famous cave, which is called the *Purgatory of St.* PATRICK, the reader may conſult LE BRUN, *Hiſtoire Critique des pratiques Superſtitieuſes*, tom. iv. p. 34.

church; and is ſtill generally acknowledged and revered in that honourable character.

The cauſes of theſe converſions.

VII. The cauſes and circumſtances by which theſe different nations were engaged to abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors, and to embrace the religion of JESUS, may be eaſily deduced from the facts we have related in the hiſtory of their converſion. It would, indeed, be an inſtance of the blindeſt and moſt perverſe partiality not to acknowledge, that the labours and zeal of great and eminent men contributed to this happy purpoſe, and were the means by which the darkneſs of many was turned into light. But, on the other hand, they muſt be very inattentive and ſuperficial obſervers of things, who do not perceive that the fear of puniſhment, the proſpect of honours and advantages, and the deſire of obtaining ſuccour againſt their enemies from the countenance of the Chriſtians, or the miraculous influences of their religion, were the prevailing motives that induced the greateſt part to renounce the ſervice of their impotent gods.

How far theſe converſions were due to real miracles attending the miniſtry of theſe early preachers, is a matter extremely difficult to be determined. For though I am perſuaded that thoſe pious men, who, in the midſt of many dangers, and in the face of obſtacles ſeemingly invincible, endeavoured to ſpred the light of Chriſtianity through the barbarous nations, were ſometimes accompanied with the more peculiar preſence and ſuccours of the moſt high [s]; yet I am equally convinced, that the greateſt part of the prodigies, recorded in the hiſtories of this age, are liable to the ſtrongeſt ſuſpicions of falſhood or impoſture. The ſimplicity and ignorance of the generality in thoſe times furniſhed the moſt favourable occaſion for the exerciſe of fraud; and the impudence of impoſtors in contriving falſe miracles, was artfully proportioned to the credulity of the vulgar [t], while the ſagacious and the wiſe, who perceived theſe cheats, were obliged to ſilence by the dangers that threatned their lives and fortunes, did they diſcover the artifice [u]. Thus does it generally happen in human life, that when the diſcovery and profeſſion of the truth is attended with danger, the prudent are *ſilent*, the multitude *believe*, and impoſtors *triumph*.

---

[s] There is a remarkable paſſage, relating to the miracles of this century, in ÆNEAS GAZAEUS's *Dialogue concerning the Immortality of the Soul*, &c. intitled, *Theophraſtus*, p. 78. 80, 81. edit. Barthii. See the controverſy concerning the time when miracles ceaſed in the church, that was carried on ſome years ago, on occaſion of Dr. MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c.

[t] This is ingenuouſly confeſſed by the Benedictine monks, *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 33. and happily expreſſed by LIVY, *Hiſt.* lib. xxiv. cap. x. § 6. *Prodigia multa nuntiata ſunt, quæ quo magis credebant ſimplices et religioſi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur.*

[u] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. p. 438. *Ep.* i. p. 457. *Dial.* iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The Chriſtians ſuffer in the Roman empire.

I. IT has been already obſerved, that the Goths, the Heruli, the Francs, the Huns, and the Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations, for the moſt part ſtrangers to Chriſtianity, had invaded the Roman empire, and rent it aſunder in the moſt deplorable manner. Amidſt theſe calamities, the Chriſtians were grievous, nay, we may venture to ſay, the principal ſufferers. It is true, theſe ſavage nations were much more intent upon the acquiſition of wealth and dominion, than upon the propagation or ſupport of the Pagan ſuperſtitions; nor did their cruelty and oppoſition to the Chriſtians ariſe from any religious principle, or from an enthuſiaſtic deſire to ruin the cauſe of Chriſtianity; it was merely by the inſtigation of the Pagans, who remained yet in the empire, that they were excited to treat with ſuch ſeverity and violence the followers of CHRIST. The painful conſideration of their abrogated rites, and the hopes of recovering their former liberty and privileges, by the means of their new maſters, induced the worſhipers of the gods to ſeize with avidity every opportunity of inſpiring them with the moſt bitter averſion to the Chriſtians. Their endeavours, however, were without the deſired effect, and their expectations were entirely diſappointed. The greateſt part of theſe barbarians embraced Chriſtianity; though it be alſo true, that in the beginning of their uſurpations, the profeſſors of that religion ſuffered heavily under the rigour of their government.

The attempts of the Pagans to deſtroy their credit.

II. To deſtroy the credit of the goſpel, and to excite the hatred of the multitude againſt the Chriſtians, the Pagans took occaſion, from the calamities and tumults which diſtracted the empire, to renew the obſolete complaint of their anceſtors againſt Chriſtianity, as the ſource of theſe complicated woes. They alleged, that before the coming of CHRIST, the world was bleſſed with peace and proſperity; but that ſince the progreſs of his religion every where, the gods, filled with indignation to ſee their worſhip neglected and their altars abandoned, had viſited the earth with thoſe plagues and deſolations, which increaſed every day. This feeble objection was entirely removed by AUGUSTIN, in his book *Concerning the city of God*; a work extremely rich and ample in point of matter, and filled with the moſt profound and diverſified erudition. It alſo drew a complete confutation from the learned pen of OROSIUS, who in a hiſtory written expreſly for that purpoſe, ſhewed, with the utmoſt evidence, that not only the ſame calamities now complained of, but alſo plagues of a much more dreadful kind had afflicted mankind before the Chriſtian religion appeared in the world.

The calamities of the times produced ſtill more pernicious effects upon the religious ſentiments of the Gauls. They introduced among that people the moſt deſperate notions, and led many of them to reject the belief of a ſuperintending providence, and to exclude the deity from the government of the univerſe. Againſt theſe frenetic infidels, SALVIAN wrote his book *Concerning the divine government*.

The perſecutions they ſuffered.

III. Hitherto we have given only a general view of the ſufferings of the Chriſtians; it is however proper, that we enter into a more diſtinct and particular account of that matter.

In *Gaul*, and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals, whoſe cruel and ſacrilegious ſoldiery reſpected neither the majeſty of religion, nor the rights of humanity, committed acts of barbarity and violence againſt a multitude of Chriſtians.

In *Britain*, a long ſeries of tumults and diviſions involved the Chriſtians in many troubles. When the affairs of the Romans declined in that country, the Britons were tormented by the Picts and Scots, nations remarkable for their violence and ferocity. Hence, after many ſufferings and diſaſters, they choſe, in the year 445, VORTIGERN for their king. This prince, finding himſelf too weak to make head againſt the enemies of his country, called the Anglo-Saxons from *Germany* to his aid in the year 449. The conſequences of this meaſure were pernicious, and it ſoon appeared that this people, who came as auxiliaries into *Britain*, oppreſſed it with calamities more grievous than thoſe which it had ſuffered from its enemies. For the Saxons aimed at nothing leſs than to ſubdue the ancient inhabitants of the country, and to reduce the whole iſland under their dominion. Hence a moſt bloody and obſtinate war aroſe between the Britons and Saxons, which, after having been carried on, during the ſpace of an hundred and thirty years, with various ſucceſs, ended in the defeat of the Britons, who were forced to yield to the Anglo-Saxons, and to ſeek a retreat in *Batavia* and *Cambria*. During theſe commotions, the ſtate of the Britiſh church was deplorable beyond expreſſion; it was almoſt totally overwhelmed and extinguiſhed by the Anglo-Saxons, who adhered to the worſhip of the gods, and put an immenſe number of Chriſtians to the moſt cruel deaths [*w*].

In *Perſia*.

IV. In *Perſia*, the Chriſtians ſuffered grievouſly by the imprudent zeal of ABDAS, biſhop of *Suza*, who pulled down the *pyræum*, which was a temple dedicated to *fire*. For when this obſtinate prelate was ordered by the king (ISDEGERDES) to rebuild that temple, he refuſed to comply; for which he was put to death in the year 414, and the churches of the Chriſtians were levelled to the ground. This perſecution was not, however, of long duration, but ſeems to have been extinguiſhed ſoon after its commencement.

VARARENES, the ſon of the monarch already mentioned, treated the Chriſtians in a manner yet more barbarous and inhuman in the year 421, to which he was led partly by the inſtigation of the Magi, and partly by his keen averſion to the Romans, with whom he was at war. For as often as the Perſians and the Romans were at variance, ſo often did the Chriſtians, who dwelt in *Perſia*, feel new and redoubled effects of their monarch's wrath; and this from a prevailing notion, not perhaps entirely groundleſs, that they

---

[w] See, beſides BEDE and GILDA, JAC. USSER. *Antiquitat. Eccleſiæ Britannicæ*, cap. xii. p. 415. RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire d'Angleterre*, tom. i. livr. ii. p. 91.

favoured the Romans, and rendered real ſervices to their republic [*x*]. In this perſecution, a prodigious number of Chriſtians periſhed in the moſt exquiſite tortures, and by various kinds of puniſhments [*y*]. But they were, at length, delivered from theſe cruel oppreſſions by the peace that was made in the year 427, between VARARANES and the Roman empire [*z*].

It was not from the Pagans only, that the Chriſtians were expoſed to ſuffering and perſecution; they were, moreover, harraſſed and oppreſſed in a variety of ways by the Jews, who lived in great opulence, and enjoyed a high degree of favour and credit in ſeveral parts of the eaſt [*a*]. Among theſe none treated them with greater rigour and arrogance than GAMALIEL, the patriarch of that nation, a man of the greateſt power and influence, whoſe authority and violence were, on that account, reſtrained in the year 415, by an expreſs and particular edict of THEODOSIUS the younger [*b*].

Chriſtianity oppoſed by ſecret enemies.

V. It does not appear from any records of hiſtory now remaining, that any writings againſt CHRIST and his followers were publiſhed in this century, unleſs we conſider as ſuch the hiſtories of OLYMPIODORUS [*c*] and ZOSIMUS, of whom the latter loſes no opportunity of reviling the Chriſtians, and loading them with the moſt unjuſt and bitter reproaches. But though the number of books written againſt Chriſtianity was ſo ſmall, yet we are not to ſuppoſe that its adverſaries had laid aſide the ſpirit of oppoſition. The ſchools of the philoſophers and rhetoricians were yet open in *Greece*, *Syria*, and *Egypt*; and there is no doubt but that theſe ſubtle teachers laboured aſſiduouſly to corrupt the minds of the youth, and to inſtill into them, at leaſt, ſome of the principles of the ancient ſuperſtition [*d*]. The hiſtory of theſe times, and the writings of ſeveral Chriſtians who lived in this century, exhibit evident proofs of theſe clandeſtine methods of oppoſing the progreſs of the goſpel.

[*x*] THEODORET, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v. cap. xxxix. p. 245. BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ABDAS. BARBEYRAC, *De la morale des Peres*, p. 320.

[*y*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 182. 248.

[*z*] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xx. p. 358.

[*a*] SOCRATES, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. vii. cap. xiii. p. 349. cap. xvi. p. 353. *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 265.

[*b*] *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. vi. p. 262.

[*c*] PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* lxxx. p. 178.

[*d*] ZACHARIAS MITYLEN, *De opificio Dei*, p. 165. 200. edit. Barthii.

PART

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of learning and philoſophy.

CENT. V.

The ſtate of letters among the Chriſtians.

I. THOUGH, in this century, the illiterate and ignorant were advanced to eminent and important ſtations, both eccleſiaſtical and civil, yet we muſt not conclude from thence, that the ſciences were held in univerſal contempt. The value of learning, and the excellence of the *finer arts*, were yet generally acknowledged among the thinking part of mankind. Hence public ſchools were erected in almoſt all the great cities, ſuch as *Conſtantinople*, *Rome*, *Marſeille*, *Edeſſa*, *Niſibis*, *Carthage*, *Lyons*, and *Treves*; and public inſtructors of capacity and genius were ſet apart for the education of the youth, and maintained at the expence of the emperors. Several biſhops and monks contributed alſo to the advancement of knowledge, by imparting to others their ſmall ſtock of learning and ſcience. But the infelicity of the times, the incurſions of the barbarous nations, and the ſcarcity of great geniuſes, rendered the fruits of theſe excellent eſtabliſhments much leſs than their generous founders and promoters expected.

In the weſt.

II. In the weſtern provinces, and eſpecially in *Gaul*, there were, indeed, ſome men eminently diſtinguiſhed by their learning and talents, and every way proper to ſerve as models to the lower orders in the republic of letters. Of this we have abundant proof from the writings of MACROBIUS, SALVIAN, VINCENTIUS biſhop of *Liris*, ENNODIUS, SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, CLAUDIAN, MAMERTUS, DRACONTIUS, and others, who, though in ſome reſpects inferior to the more celebrated authors of antiquity, are yet far from being deſtitute of elegance, and diſcover in their productions a moſt laborious application to literary reſearches of various kinds. But the barbarous nations, which either ſpred deſolation, or formed ſettlements in the Roman territories, choked the growth of thoſe genial ſeeds, which the hand of ſcience had ſowed in more auſpicious times. Theſe ſavage invaders, poſſeſſed of no other ambition than that of conqueſt, and looking upon military courage as the only ſource of true virtue and ſolid glory, beheld of conſequence the arts and ſciences with the utmoſt contempt. Wherever, therefore, they extended their conqueſts, ignorance and darkneſs followed their ſteps, and the culture of the ſciences was confined to the prieſts and monks alone. And, even among theſe, learning degenerated from its primitive luſtre, and put on the moſt unſeemly and fantaſtic form. Amidſt the ſeduction of corrupt examples, the alarms of perpetual danger, and the horrors and devaſtations of war, the Sacerdotal and Monaſtic orders loſt, gradually, all taſte for ſolid ſcience, in the place of which they ſubſtituted a lifeleſs ſpectre, an enormous phantom of barbarous erudition. They, indeed, kept public ſchools, and inſtructed the youth in, what they called, the *Seven liberal arts*; but theſe, as we learn from AUGUSTIN's account of them, conſiſted only of a certain number of dry, ſubtile, and uſeleſs precepts; and were, conſequently, more adapted to load and perplex the memory, than to improve and ſtrengthen the judgment. So that, towards the concluſion of this century, the ſciences were almoſt totally extinguiſhed, at leaſt, what remained of them was no more than a ſhadowy form, without either ſolidity or conſiſtence.

The ſtate of philoſophy in the weſt.

III. The few that applied themſelves to the ſtudy of philoſohy in this age, had not, as yet, embraced the doctrine or method of ARISTOTLE. They looked upon the ſyſtem of this eminent philoſopher, as a labyrinth beſet with thorns and thiſtles [e]; and yet had they been able to read and underſtand his works, it is probable, that many of them would have become his followers. The doctrine of PLATO had a more eſtabliſhed reputation, which it had enjoyed for ſeveral ages, and was conſidered not only as leſs ſubtile and difficult than that of the Stagirite, but alſo as more conformable to the genius and ſpirit of the Chriſtian religion. Beſides, the moſt valuable of PLATO's works were tranſlated into Latin by VICTORINUS, and were thus adapted to general uſe [f]. And SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS [g] informs us, that all thoſe, among the Latins, who had any inclination to the ſtudy of truth, fell into the Platonic notions, and followed that ſage as their philoſophical guide.

In the eaſt.

IV. The fate of learning was leſs deplorable among the Greeks and Orientals, than in the weſtern provinces; and not only the ſeveral branches of polite literature, but alſo the more ſolid and profound ſciences were cultivated by them with tolerable ſucceſs. Hence we find among them more writers of genius and learning, than in other countries. Thoſe, who inclined to the ſtudy of law, reſorted generally to *Berytus*, famous for its learned academy [h], or to *Alexandria* [i], which latter city was frequented by the ſtudents of phyſic and chemiſtry. The profeſſors of eloquence, poetry, philoſophy, and the other liberal arts taught the youth in public ſchools, which were erected in almoſt every city. Thoſe, however, of *Alexandria*, *Conſtantinople*, and *Edeſſa*, were looked upon as ſuperior to all others both in point of erudition and method [k].

Modern Platonics.

V. The doctrine and ſect of the Modern Platonics retained as yet, among the Syrians and Alexandrians, a conſiderable part of their ancient ſplendor. OLYMPIODORUS, HERO [l], and other philoſophers of the firſt rank, added a luſtre to the Alexandrian ſchool. That of *Athens* was rendered famous by the talents and erudition of THEOPHRASTUS, PLUTARCH, and his ſucceſſor

---

[e] The paſſages of different writers, that prove what is here advanced, are collected by LAUNOIUS, in his book, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna in Academia Pariſienſi.*

[f] See AUGUSTINI *Confeſſionum* lib. i. cap. ii. § 1. p. 105, 106. tom. i. Opp.

[g] See his *Epiſtles*, book iv. *ep.* iii. xi. book ix. *ep.* ix.

[h] See HASÆI *Libr. de Academia Jureconſultorum Berytenſi*; as alſo MITYLENÆUS, *De opificio Dei*, p. 164.

[i] ZACH. MITYLENÆUS, *De opificio Dei*, p. 179.

[k] ÆNEAS GAZÆUS *in Theophraſto*, p. 6, 7. 16, &c.

[l] MARINUS, *vita Procli*, cap. ix. p. 19. edit. Fabricii.

SYRIAN. Theſe were the inſtructors of the renowned PROCLUS, who far ſurpaſſed all the Platonic philoſophers of this century, and acquired ſuch a high degree of the public eſteem, as enabled him to give new life to the doctrine of PLATO, and to reſtore it to its former credit in *Greece* [m]. MARINUS of *Neapolis*, AMMONIUS the ſon of HERMIAS, ISIDORUS, and DAMASCIUS, the diſciples of PROCLUS, followed, with an ardent emulation, the traces of their maſter, and formed ſucceſſors that reſembled them in all reſpects. But the imperial laws, and the daily progreſs of the Chriſtian religion, gradually diminiſhed the luſtre and authority of theſe philoſophers [n]. And as there were many of the Chriſtian doctors who adopted the Platonic ſyſtem, and were ſufficiently qualified to explain it to the youth, this hindered, naturally, the ſchools of theſe heathen ſages from being ſo much frequented as they had formerly been.

The philoſophy of Ariſtotle riſes into credit.

VI. The credit of the Platonic philoſophy, and the preference that was given to it, as more excellent in itſelf, and leſs repugnant to the genius of the goſpel than other ſyſtems, did not prevent the doctrine of ARISTOTLE from coming to light after a long ſtruggle, and forcing its way into the Chriſtian church. The Platonics themſelves interpreted, in their ſchools, ſome of the writings of ARISTOTLE, particularly his Dialectics, and recommended that work to ſuch of the youth as had a taſte for logical diſcuſſions, and were fond of diſputing. In this, the Chriſtian doctors imitated the manner of the heathen ſchools, and this was the firſt ſtep to that univerſal dominion, which the Stagirite afterward obtained in the republic of letters. A ſecond, and a yet larger ſtride which the Ariſtotelian philoſophy made towards this univerſal empire, was, during the controverſies which ORIGEN had occaſioned, and the Arian, Eutychian, Neſtorian, and Pelagian diſſenſions, which, in this century, were ſo fruitful of calamities to the Chriſtian church. ORIGEN, as is well known, was zealouſly attached to the Platonic ſyſtem. When therefore he was publicly condemned, many, to avoid the imputation of his errors, and to prevent their being counted among the number of his followers, adopted openly the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, which was entirely different from that of ORIGEN. The Neſtorian, Arian, and Eutychian controverſies were managed, or rather drawn out, on both ſides, by a perpetual recourſe to ſubtle diſtinctions, and captious ſophiſms. And no philoſophy was ſo proper to furniſh ſuch weapons, as that of ARISTOTLE; for that of PLATO was far from being adapted to form the mind to the Polemic arts. Beſides, the Pelagian doctrine bore a ſtriking reſemblance of the Platonic opinions concerning God and the human ſoul; and this was an additional reaſon which engaged many to deſert the Platoniſts, and to aſſume, at leaſt, the name of Peripatetics.

---

[m] The life of PROCLUS, written by MARINUS, was publiſhed in 4to at *Hamburg*, in the year 1700, by JOHN ALBERT FABRICIUS, and was enriched, by this famous editor, with a great number of learned obſervations.

[n] See ÆNEAS GAZÆUS *in Theophraſto*, p. 6, 7, 8. 13. edit. Barthii.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the Chriſtian church, and its form of government.

The external form of church-government ſomewhat changed.

I. SEVERAL cauſes contributed to bring about a change in the external form of eccleſiaſtical government. The power of the biſhops, particularly thoſe of the firſt order, was ſometimes augmented, and ſometimes diminiſhed, according as the times and the occaſions offered; and in all theſe changes the intrigues of the court and the political ſtate of the empire had much more influence, than the rules of equity and wiſdom.

Theſe alterations were, indeed, matters of ſmall moment. But an affair of much greater conſequence drew now the general attention, and this was the vaſt augmentation of honours and rank that was at this time accumulated upon the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, in oppoſition to the moſt vigorous efforts of the Roman pontif. In the preceding century, the council of *Conſtantinople* had, on account of the dignity and privileges of that imperial city, conferred upon its biſhops a place among the firſt rulers of the Chriſtian church. This new dignity adding fuel to their ambition, they extended their views of authority and dominion; and encouraged, no doubt, by the conſent of the emperor, reduced the provinces of *Aſia*, *Thrace*, and *Pontus* under their ghoſtly juriſdiction. In this century, they graſped at ſtill further acceſſions of power; ſo that not only the whole eaſtern part of *Illyricum* was added to their former acquiſitions, but they were alſo exalted to the higheſt ſummit of eccleſiaſtical authority. For by the XXVIIIth *Canon*, of the council held at *Chalcedon* in the year 451, it was reſolved, that the ſame rights and honours, which had been conferred upon the biſhop of *Rome*, were due to the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, on account of the equal dignity and luſtre of the two cities, in which theſe prelates exerciſed their authority. The ſame council confirmed alſo by a ſolemn act the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* in the ſpiritual government of thoſe provinces over which he had ambitiouſly uſurped the juriſdiction. LEO the GREAT, biſhop of *Rome*, oppoſed, with vehemence, the paſſing of theſe decrees, and his oppoſition was ſeconded by that of ſeveral other prelates. But their efforts were vain, as the emperors threw in their weight into the balance, and thus ſupported the deciſions of the Grecian biſhops [*o*]. In conſequence then of the decrees of this famous council, the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* began to contend obſtinately for the ſupremacy with the Roman pontif, and to cruſh the biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, ſo as to make them feel the oppreſſive effects of his pretended ſuperiority. And none diſtinguiſhed himſelf more by his ambition and arrogance in this matter, than ACACIUS, one of the biſhops of that imperial city [*p*].

The ambition of Juvenal.

II. It was much about this time that JUVENAL, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, or rather of *Ælia*, attempted to withdraw himſelf and his church from the juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Cæſarea*, and aſpired after a place among the firſt prelates of the Chriſtian world. The high degree of veneration and eſteem, in which the church of *Jeruſalem* was held among all other Chriſtian ſocieties (on account of its rank among the apoſtolical churches, and its title to the appellation of *mother-church*, as having ſucceeded the firſt Chriſtian aſſembly founded by the apoſtles) was extremely favourable to the ambition of JUVENAL, and rendered his project much more practicable, than it would otherwiſe have been. Encouraged by this, and animated by the favour and protection of THEODOSIUS the younger, the aſpiring prelate not only aſſumed the dignity of Patriarch of all *Paleſtine* [q], a rank that rendered him ſupreme and independent of all ſpiritual authority, but alſo invaded the rights of the biſhop of *Antioch*, and uſurped his juriſdiction over the provinces of *Phœnicia* and *Arabia*. Hence there aroſe a warm conteſt between JUVENAL and MAXIMUS biſhop of *Antioch*, which the council of *Chalcedon* decided by reſtoring to the latter the provinces of *Phœnicia* and *Arabia*; and confirming the former in ſpiritual poſſeſſion of all *Paleſtine* [r], and in the high rank which he had aſſumed in the church [s]. By this means, there were created, in this century, five ſuperior rulers of the church, who were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt, by the title of Patriarchs [t]. The Oriental hiſtorians mention a ſixth, *viz.* the biſhop of *Seleucia* and *Cteſiphon*, to whom, according to their account, the biſhop of *Antioch* voluntarily ceded a part of his juriſdiction [u]. But this addition to the number of the patriarchs is unworthy of credit, as the only proof of it is drawn from the Arabic *laws* of the council of *Nice*, which are notoriouſly deſtitute of all authority.

[*o*] LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſt.* tom. i. p. 36.

[*p*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary* in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS.

The rights and privileges of the patriarchs.

III. The patriarchs were diſtinguiſhed by conſiderable and extenſive rights and privileges, that were annexed to their high ſtation. They alone conſecrated the biſhops, who lived in the provinces that belonged to their juriſdiction. They aſſembled yearly in council, the clergy of their reſpective diſtricts, in order to regulate the affairs of the church. The cognizance of all important cauſes, and the determination of the more weighty controverſies, were referred to the patriarch of the province where they aroſe. They alſo pronounced a deciſive judgment in thoſe caſes, where accuſations were brought againſt biſhops. And, laſtly, they appointed *vicars* [w], or deputies, cloathed

---

[(q) By *All Paleſtine*, the reader is deſired to underſtand, three diſtinct provinces, of which each bore the name of *Paleſtine*, and accordingly the original is thus expreſſed, *Trium Palæſtinarum Epiſcopum ſeu Patriarcham*. After the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, the face of *Paleſtine* was almoſt totally changed; and it was ſo parcelled out and waſted by a ſucceſſion of wars and invaſions, that it preſerved ſcarcely any trace of its former condition. Under the Chriſtian emperors there were *Three Paleſtines* formed out of the ancient country of that name, each of which was an epiſcopal ſee. And it was of theſe three dioceſes that JUVENAL uſurped and maintained the juriſdiction. See, for a further account of the *Three Paleſtines*, SPANHEMII *Geographia Sacra*, Opp. tom. i. p. 79.]

[r] See alſo, for an account of the *Three Paleſtines*, CAROLI à S. PAULO *Geographia Sacra*, p. 307.

[s] See MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 110.

[t] See the authors who have written concerning the Patriarchs, which are mentioned and recommended by the learned FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xiii. p. 453.

[u] ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 9. 13, &c.

[w] DAV. BLONDEL. *De la Primauté de l'Egliſe*, ch. xxv. p. 332. THEOD. RUINART, *De pallio Archi-Epiſcopali*, p. 445. tom. ii. of the poſthumous works of MABILLON.

with their authority, for the preſervation of order and tranquillity in the remoter provinces. Such were the great and diſtinguiſhing privileges of the patriarchs, and they were accompanied with others of leſs moment, which it is needleſs to mention.

It muſt, however, be carefully obſerved, that the authority of the patriarchs was not acknowleged through all the provinces without exception. Several diſtricts, both in the eaſtern and weſtern empires, were exempted from their juriſdiction [*x*]. Beſides, the emperors, who reſerved to themſelves the *ſupreme* power in the Chriſtian hierarchy, and received, with great facility and readineſs, the complaints of thoſe who conſidered themſelves as injured by the patriarchs; the councils alſo, in which the majeſty and legiſlative power of the church immediately reſided; all theſe were ſo many obſtacles to the arbitrary proceedings of the patriarchal order.

The inconveniencies that accompanied the patriarchal authority and government.

IV. This conſtitution of eccleſiaſtical government was ſo far from contributing to the peace and proſperity of the Chriſtian church, that it proved, on the contrary, a perpetual ſource of diſſenſions and animoſities, and was productive of various inconveniencies and grievances. The patriarchs, who, by their exalted rank and extenſive authority, were equally able to do much good and much miſchief, began to encroach upon the rights, and to trample upon the prerogatives of their biſhops, and thus introduced, gradually, a ſort of ſpiritual bondage into the church. And that they might invade, without oppoſition, the rights of the biſhops, they permitted the biſhops, in their turn, to trample, with impunity, upon the ancient rights and privileges of the people. For, in proportion as the biſhops multiplied their privileges and extended their uſurpations, the patriarchs gained new acceſſions of power by the deſpotiſm which they exerciſed over the epiſcopal order. They fomented alſo diviſions among the biſhops, and excited animoſities between the biſhops and the other miniſters of the church; nay, they went ſtill further, and ſowed the ſeeds of diſcord between the clergy and the people, that all theſe combuſtions might furniſh them with perpetual matter for the exerciſe of their authority, and procure them a multitude of clients and dependants. They left no artifice unemployed to ſtrengthen their own authority, and to raiſe oppoſition againſt the biſhops from every quarter. For this purpoſe it was, that they engaged in their cauſe by the moſt alluring promiſes, and attached to their intereſts by the moſt magnificent acts of liberality, whole ſwarms of monks, who ſerved as inteſtine enemies to the biſhops, and as a dead weight on the ſide of patriarchal tyranny. Theſe monaſtic hirelings contributed more than any thing elſe, to ruin the ancient eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, to diminiſh the authority of the biſhops, and raiſe, to an enormous and exceſſive height, the power and prerogatives of their inſolent and ambitious patrons.

The contentions of the patriarchs.

V. To theſe lamentable evils were added the ambitious quarrels, and the bitter animoſities that aroſe among the patriarchs themſelves, and which produced the moſt bloody wars, and the moſt deteſtable and horrid crimes.

---

[x] EDWARD. BREREWODIUS, *Diſſert. de veteris Eccleſiæ gubernatione Patriarchali*; which is printed at the end of arch-biſhop USHER's book, intitled, *Opuſculum de origine Epiſcoporum et Metropolitan.*

The patriarch of *Conſtantinople* diſtinguiſhed himſelf in theſe odious conteſts. Elated with the favour and proximity of the imperial court, he caſt a haughty eye on all ſides, where any objects were to be found, on which he might exerciſe his lordly ambition. On the one hand, he reduced, under his juriſdiction, the patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, as prelates only of the ſecond order; and on the other, he invaded the dioceſe of the Roman pontif, and ſpoiled him of ſeveral provinces. The two former prelates, though they ſtruggled with vehemence, and raiſed conſiderable tumults by their oppoſition, yet they ſtruggled ineffectually, both for want of ſtrength, and likewiſe on account of a variety of unfavourable circumſtances. But the Roman pontif, far ſuperior to them in wealth and power, contended alſo with more vigour and obſtinacy, and, in his turn, gave a deadly wound to the uſurped ſupremacy of the Byzantine patriarch.

The attentive inquirer into the affairs of the church, from this period, will find, in the events now mentioned, the principal ſource of thoſe moſt ſcandalous and deplorable diſſenſions, which divided, firſt, the eaſtern church into various ſects, and afterwards ſeparated it entirely from that of the weſt. He will find, that theſe ignominious ſchiſms flowed chiefly from the unchriſtian contentions for dominion and ſupremacy which reigned among thoſe who ſet themſelves up for the fathers and defenders of the church.

The power of the biſhop of Rome.

VI. None of the contending biſhops found the occurrences of the times ſo favourable to his ambition, as the Roman pontif. Notwithſtanding the redoubled efforts of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, a variety of circumſtances united in augmenting his power and authority, though he had not, as yet, aſſumed the dignity of ſupreme law-giver and judge of the whole Chriſtian church. The biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, unable to make head againſt the lordly prelate of *Conſtantinople*, fled often to the Roman pontif for ſuccour againſt his violence; and the inferior order of biſhops uſed the ſame method, when their rights were invaded by the prelates of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. So that the biſhop of *Rome*, by taking all theſe prelates alternately under his protection, daily added new degrees of influence and authority to the Roman ſee, rendered it every where reſpected, and was thus imperceptibly eſtabliſhing its ſupremacy. Such were the means by which the Roman pontif extended his dominion in the eaſt. In the weſt its increaſe was owing to other cauſes. The declining power and the ſupine indolence of the emperors, left the authority of the biſhop who preſided in their imperial city almoſt without controul. The incurſions, moreover, and triumphs of the Barbarians were ſo far from being prejudicial to his riſing dominion, that they rather contributed to its advancement. For the kings, who penetrated into the empire, were only ſolicitous about the methods of giving a ſufficient degree of ſtability to their reſpective governments. And when they perceived the ſubjection of the multitude to the biſhops, and the dependance of the biſhops upon the Roman pontif, they immediately reſolved to reconcile this ghoſtly ruler to their intereſts, by loading him with benefits and honours of various kinds.

Among all the prelates who ruled the church of *Rome* during this century, there was none who aſſerted, with ſuch vigour and ſucceſs, the authority and pretenſions of the Roman pontif, as LEO, commonly ſurnamed the GREAT. It muſt be, however, obſerved, that neither he, nor the other promoters of that cauſe, were able to overcome all the obſtacles that were laid in their way, nor the various checks which were given to their ambition. Many examples might be alleged in proof of this point, particularly the caſe of the Africans, whom no threats nor promiſes could engage to ſubmit the deciſion of their controverſies, and the determination of their cauſes to the Roman tribunal [y].

The vices of the clergy.

VII. The vices of the clergy were now carried to the moſt enormous lengths, and all the writers of this century, whoſe probity and virtue render them worthy of credit, are unanimous in their accounts of the luxury, arrogance, avarice, and voluptuouſneſs of the ſacerdotal orders. The *biſhops*, and particularly thoſe of the firſt rank, created various delegates, or miniſters, who managed for them the affairs of their dioceſes, and a ſort of courts were gradually formed, where theſe pompous eccleſiaſtics gave audience, and received the homage of a cringing multitude The office of a *preſbyter* was looked upon of ſuch a high and eminent nature, that MARTIN, biſhop of *Tours*, was ſo audacious as to maintain at a public entertainment, that the emperor was inferior, in dignity, to one of that order [z]. As to the *deacons*, their pride and licentiouſneſs occaſioned many and grievous complaints, as appears from the decrees of ſeveral councils [a].

Theſe opprobrious ſtains, in the characters of the clergy, would never have been ſupported, had not the greateſt part of mankind been ſunk in ſuperſtition and ignorance, and all in general formed their ideas of the rights and liberties of Chriſtian miniſters, from the model exhibited by the ſacerdotal orders among the Hebrews, the Greeks, and Romans, during the law of MOSES, and the darkneſs of paganiſm. The barbarous nations alſo, thoſe fierce and warlike Germans, who, after the defeat of the Romans, divided among them the weſtern empire, bore, with the utmoſt patience and moderation, both the dominion and vices of the biſhops and prieſts, becauſe, upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, they became naturally ſubject to their juriſdiction; and ſtill more, becauſe they looked upon the miniſters of CHRIST, as inveſted with the ſame rights and privileges, which diſtinguiſhed the prieſts of their fictitious deities.

The ſources from whence proceeded the vices of the clergy.

VIII. The corruption of that order, who were appointed to promote, by their doctrine and examples, the ſacred intereſts of piety and virtue, will appear leſs ſurprizing when we conſider, that multitudes of people of all kinds were every where admitted without examination and without choice into the body of the clergy, the greateſt part of whom had no other view, than the enjoyment of a lazy and inglorious repoſe. Many of theſe eccleſiaſtics were confined to no fixed places or aſſemblies, had no employment of any kind, but ſauntered about wherever they pleaſed, gaining their maintenance by impoſing upon the ignorant multitude, and ſometimes by mean and diſhoneſt practices. But if any ſuch aſk, how this account is reconcileable with the number of ſaints, who, according to the teſtimonies of both the eaſtern and weſtern writers, are ſaid to have ſhone forth in this century? The anſwer is obvious; theſe ſaints were canonized by the ignorance of the times. For, in an age of darkneſs and corruption, thoſe, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the multitude either by their genius, their writings, or their eloquence; by their prudence and dexterity in managing matters of importance, or by their meekneſs and moderation, and the aſcendant they had gained over their reſentments and paſſions; all ſuch were eſteemed ſomething more than men, they were reverenced as gods; or, to ſpeak more properly, they appeared to others as men divinely inſpired, and full of the deity.

---

[y] LUD. EL. DU PIN, *De antiqua Eccleſiæ Diſciplina, Diſſ.* ii. p. 166. MELCH. LEYDECKERI, *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Africanæ,* tom. ii. *Diſſ.* ii. p. 505.

[z] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *De vita Martini*, cap. xx. p. 339. compared with *Dialog.* ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

[a] See DAV. BLONDEL. *Apologia pro ſententia Hieronymi de epiſcopis et preſbyteris*, p. 140.

The monks.

IX. The monks, who had formerly lived only for themſelves in ſolitary retreats, and had never thought of aſſuming any rank among the ſacerdotal order, were now gdradually diſtinguiſhed from the populace, and were endowed with ſuch opulence, and ſuch honourable privileges, that they found themſelves in a condition to claim an eminent ſtation among the ſupports and pillars of the Chriſtian community [*b*]. The fame of their piety and ſanctity was, at firſt ſo great, that biſhops and preſbyters were often choſen out of their order [*c*], and the paſſion of erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might ſerve God in the moſt commodious manner, was, at this time, carried beyond all bounds [*d*].

The Monaſtic orders did not all obſerve the ſame rule of diſcipline, nor the ſame manner of living. Some followed the rule of AUGUSTINE, others that of BASIL, others that of ANTONY, others that of ATHANASIUS, others that of PACHOMIUS; but they muſt all have become extremely negligent and remiſs in obſerving the laws of their reſpective orders, ſince the licentiouſneſs of the monks, even in this century, was become a proverb [*e*], and they are ſaid to have excited the moſt dreadful tumults and ſeditions in various places. All the Monaſtic orders of all ſorts, were under the protection of the biſhops in whoſe provinces they lived, nor did the patriarchs claim any authority over them, as appears with the utmoſt evidence from the decrees of the councils held in this century [*f*].

Greek writers.

X. Several writers of conſiderable merit adorned this century. Among the Greeks and Orientals the firſt place is due to CYRIL, biſhop of *Alexandria*, ſo famous for his learned productions, and the various controverſies in which he was engaged. It would be unjuſt to derogate from the praiſes which are due to this eminent man: but it would betray, on the other hand, a criminal partiality, did we paſs uncenſured the turbulent ſpirit, the litigious and contentious temper, and the other defects, which are laid to his charge [*g*].

[*b*] EPIPHANIUS, *Expoſit. fidei*, tom. i. Opp. p. 1094. MABILLON, *Reponſe aux Chanoines Regulieres*, tom. ii. of his poſthumous works, p. 115.

[*c*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *De vita Martini*, cap. x. p. 320. *Dial.* i. cap. xxi. p. 426.

[*d*] SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. p. 419. NORISIUS, *Hiſtor. Pelag.* lib. i. cap. iii. p. 273. tom. i. Opp. *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 35.

[*e*] SULP. SEVERUS, *Dial.* i. cap. viii. p. 399.

[*f*] See JO. LAUNOII *Inquiſitio in chartam immunitatis B. Germani*, Opp. tom. iii. part. II. p. 3. In the ancient records, poſterior to this century, the monks are frequently called Clerks. (See MABILLON. *Præf. ad Sæc.* ii. *Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti*, p. 14.) And this ſhews, that they now began to be ranked among the *clergy*, or miniſters, of the church.

After CYRIL, we may place THEODORET biſhop of *Cyrus*, an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, eminent for his acquaintance with all the branches of ſacred erudition, but unfortunate in his attachment to ſome of the Neſtorian errors [*h*].

ISIDORE of *Peluſium*, was a man of uncommon learning and ſanctity. A great number [*i*] of his epiſtles are yet extant, and diſcover more piety, genius, erudition, and wiſdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers [*k*].

THEOPHILUS biſhop of *Alexandria*, few of whoſe writings are now extant, acquired an immortal name by his violent oppoſition to ORIGEN and his followers [*l*].

PALLADIUS deſerves a rank among the better ſort of authors, by his *Lauſiac hiſtory*, and his *Life of* CHRYSOSTOM.

THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, though accuſed after his death of the greateſt errors, was one of the moſt learned men of his time. Thoſe who have red, with any attention, the fragments of his writings, which are to be found in PHOTIUS, will lament the want of theſe excellent compoſitions; which are either intirely loſt, or, if any remain [*m*], are only extant among the Neſtorians, and that in the Syriac language [*n*].

NILUS, diſciple of CHRYSOSTOM, compoſed ſeveral treatiſes of a practical and pious kind; but theſe performances derive more merit from the worthy and laudable intention of their author than from any other circumſtance.

We paſs over in ſilence BASILIUS of *Seleucia*; THEDOTUS of *Ancyra*; and GELASIUS of *Cyzicum*, for the ſake of brevity.

The Latin writers.

XI. A Roman pontif, LEO I, ſurnamed the GREAT, ſhines forth at the head of the Latin writers of this century. He was a man of uncommon genius and eloquence, which he employed, however, too much in extending

---

[*g*] The works of CYRIL, in ſix volumes folio, were publiſhed at *Paris*, by AUBERT, in the year 1638.

[*h*] The Jeſuit SIRMOND gave at *Paris*, in the year 1642, a noble edition of the works of this prelate in four volumes in folio; a fifth was added by GARNIER, in 1685. [We muſt obſerve, in favour of this excellent eccleſiaſtic, ſo renowned for the ſanctity and ſimplicity of his manners, that he abandoned the doctrines of NESTORIUS, and thus effaced the ſtain he had contracted by his perſonal attachment to that heretic, and to JOHN of *Antioch*.]

[(*i*) The number of theſe *Epiſtles* amounts to 2012, which are divided into five books. They are ſhort, but admirably written, and are equally recommendable for the ſolidity of the matter, and the purity and elegance of their ſtyle.]

[*k*] The beſt edition of ISIDORE's *Epiſtles*, is that which was publiſhed in folio, by the Jeſuit SCOTT, at *Paris* in 1638.

[*l*] See EUSEB. RENAUDOTUS, *Hiſtoria Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103.

[*m*] See JOS. SIMON. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 227.

[(*n*) It appears, by this account of the works of THEODORE, that Dr. MOSHEIM had not ſeen the *Diſſertations* of the late DUKE OF ORLEANS, in one of which, that learned prince has demonſtrated that the *Commentary upon the Pſalms*, which is to be found in the *Chain* or *Collection of Corderius*, and which bears the name of THEODORE, is the production of THEODORE of his authority; a point in which his ambition was both indefatigable and exceſſive [o].

OROSIUS acquired a conſiderable degree of reputation by the *Hiſtory* he wrote to refute the cavils of the Pagans againſt Chriſtianity, and by his books againſt the Pelagians and Priſcillianiſts [p].

CASSIAN, an illiterate and ſuperſtitious man, inculcated in *Gaul*, both by his diſcourſe and his writings, the diſcipline and manner of living which prevailed among the Syrian and Egyptian monks, and was a ſort of teacher to thoſe who were called Semi-pelagians [q].

MAXIMUS of *Turin* publiſhed ſeveral *Homilies*, which are yet extant; and though ſhort, are, for the moſt part, recommendable both for their elegance and piety.

EUCHERIUS of *Lyons*, and biſhop of that city, was one of the moſt conſiderable moral writers that flouriſhed among the Latins in this century [r].

PONTIUS of *Nola* [s], diſtinguiſhed by his eminent and fervent piety, is alſo eſteemed for his poems and other good performances.

PETER, biſhop of *Ravenna*, obtained, by his eloquence, the title of *Chryſologus*; nor are his diſcourſes entirely deſtitute of genius [t].

SALVIAN was an eloquent, but, at the ſame time, a melancholy and ſour writer, who, in his vehement declamations againſt the vices of his times, unwarily diſcovers the defects of his own character [u].

PROSPER of *Aquitain*, and MARIUS MERCATOR, are abundantly known to ſuch as have employed any part of their time and attention in the ſtudy of the Pelagian diſputes, and the other controverſies that were managed in this century.

Mopſueſtia. There exiſts alſo, beſides the fragments that are to be found in PHOTIUS, a manuſcript commentary of this illuſtrious author upon the XII minor Prophets.]

[o] All the works of LEO were publiſhed at *Lyons*, in two volumes folio, in the year 1700, by the care of the celebrated QUENEL of the Oratory.

[p] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article OROSIUS. A valuable edition of this author, enriched with ancient coins and medals, was publiſhed in 4to at *Leyden*, in the year 1738, by the learned HAVERCAMP.

[q] *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 215. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth Eccleſiaſtique, par* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 156. The works of CASSIAN were publiſhed in folio at *Francfort*, in the year 1722, with a large Commentary by ALARDUS GAZÆUS.

[r] See a large account of this prelate, in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de le France*, tom. ii. p. 275.

[s] This pious and ingenious eccleſiaſtic is more generally known by the name of PAULIN. See *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 179. The beſt edition of his works is that publiſhed by LE BRUN, at *Paris*, in the year 1685, in two volumes 4to.]

[t] AGNELLI *Liber Pontificalis Eccleſiæ Ravennatenſis*, tom. i. p. 321.

[u] *Hiſt. Liter. de la France*, tom. ii. p. 517. [The authors of the hiſtory, here referred to, give a different account of SALVIAN's character. They acknowledge, that his declamations againſt the vices of the age, in his *Treatiſe againſt Avarice*, and his *Diſcourſe concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement; but they repreſent him notwithſtanding as one of the moſt humane and benevolent men of his time. It is, however, beyond all doubt, that he was extravagantly auſtere in the rules he preſcribed for the conduct of life. For what more unnatural than to recommend to Chriſtians, as a neceſſary *condition* of ſalvation, the leaving their whole ſubſtance to the poor, to the utter ruin of their children and relations? It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that his auſterity in point of diſcipline was accompanied with the moſt amiable moderation towards thoſe who differed from him in articles of faith. There is a moſt remarkable paſſage to this purpoſe, in his *Treatiſe concerning Providence*, book v. p. 100.]

VINCENT of *Lerins*, gained a laſting reputation by his ſhort, but excellent, treatiſe againſt the ſects, intitled *Commonitorium* [*w*].

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, a tumid writer, though not entirely deſtitute of eloquence; VIGILIUS of *Tapſus*; ARNOBIUS the younger, who wrote a commentary on the book of Pſalms; DRACONTIUS, and others of that claſs, are of too little conſequence to deſerve a more particular notice.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church during this century.

Many points of religion determined.

I. MANY points of religion were more largely explained, and many of its doctrines determined with more accuracy and preciſion, than they had been in the preceding ages. This was owing to the controverſies that were multiplied, at this time, throughout the Chriſtian world, concerning the *perſon, and nature of* CHRIST; the *innate corruption and depravity of man*; the *natural ability of men to live according to the dictates of the divine law*; the *neceſſity of the divine grace in order to ſalvation*; the *nature and exiſtence of human liberty*; and other ſuch intricate and perplexing queſtions. The ſacred and venerable ſimplicity of the primitive times, which required no more than a true faith in the word of God, and a ſincere obedience to his holy laws, appeared little better than ruſticity and ignorance to the ſubtile doctors of this quibbling age. Yet ſo it happened, that many of the over-curious divines, who attempted to explain the nature, and remove the difficulties of theſe intricate doctrines, ſucceeded very ill in this matter. Inſtead of leading men into the paths of humble faith and genuine piety, they bewildered them in the labyrinths of controverſy and contention, and rather darkned than illuſtrated the ſacred myſteries of religion by a thick cloud of unintelligible ſubtilties, ambiguous terms, and obſcure diſtinctions. Hence aroſe new matter of animoſity and diſpute, of bigottry and uncharitableneſs, which flowed like a torrent through ſucceeding ages, and which all human efforts ſeem unable to vanquiſh. In theſe diſputes the heat of paſſion, and the exceſſive force of religious antipathy and contradiction, hurried frequently the contending parties into the moſt dangerous extremes.

Superſtition grows apace.

II. If, before this time, the luſtre of religion was clouded with ſuperſtition, and its divine precepts adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, inſtead of diminiſhing, increaſed daily. The happy ſouls of departed Chriſtians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by aſſiduous and fervent prayers; while none ſtood up to cenſure or oppoſe this prepoſterous worſhip. The queſtion, how the prayers of mortals aſcended to the celeſtial

---

[(*w*) This work of VINCENT, which is commended by our author, ſeems ſcarcely worthy of ſuch applauſe. I ſee nothing in it, but that blind veneration for ancient opinions, which is ſo fatal to the diſcovery and progreſs of truth; and an attempt to prove, that nothing but the voice of tradition is to be conſulted in fixing the ſenſe of the Holy Scriptures. An ample account of VINCENT, PROSPER, and ARNOBIUS, is to be found in the *Hiſtoire Literaire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 305. 342. 369.]

ſpirits (a queſtion which afterwards produced much wrangling and many idle fancies) did not as yet occaſion any difficulty. For the Chriſtians of this century did not imagine that the ſouls of the ſaints were ſo entirely confined to the celeſtial manſions, as to be deprived of the privilege of viſiting mortals, and travelling, when they pleaſed, through various countries. They were further of opinion, that the places moſt frequented by departed ſpirits were thoſe where the bodies they had formerly animated were interred; and this opinion, which the Chriſtians borrowed from the Greeks and Romans, rendered the ſepulchres of the ſaints the general rendezvous of ſuppliant multitudes [*x*]. The images of thoſe, who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon ſanctity, were now honoured with a particular worſhip in ſeveral places; and many imagined, that this worſhip drew down into the images the propitious preſence of the ſaints or celeſtial beings they repreſented; deluded, perhaps, into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen prieſts, who had publiſhed the ſame thing concerning the ſtatues of Jupiter and Mercury [*y*]. A ſingular and irreſiſtible efficacy was alſo attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the croſs in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all ſorts of calamities, and in healing not only the diſeaſes of the body, but alſo thoſe of the mind [*z*]. We ſhall not enter here into a particular account of the public ſupplications, the holy pilgrimages, the ſuperſtitious ſervices paid to departed ſouls, the multiplication of temples, altars, penitential garments, and a multitude of other circumſtances that ſhewed the decline of genuine piety, and the corrupt darkneſs that was eclipſing the luſtre of primitive Chriſtianity. As there were none in theſe times to hinder the Chriſtians from retaining the opinions of their Pagan anceſtors concerning departed ſouls, heros, demons, temples, and ſuch like matters, and even transferring them into their religious ſervices; and as, inſtead of entirely aboliſhing the rites and inſtitutions of ancient times, theſe inſtitutions were ſtill obſerved with only ſome ſlight alterations; all this ſwelled of neceſſity the torrent of ſuperſtition, and deformed the beauty of the Chriſtian religion and worſhip with thoſe corrupt remains of paganiſm, which ſtill ſubſiſt in a certain church.

It will not be improper to obſerve here, that the famous Pagan doctrine, concerning the *purification of departed ſouls*, by means of a certain kind of *fire*, was more amply explained and confirmed now, than it had formerly been [*a*]. Every body knows, that this doctrine proved an inexhauſtible ſource of riches to the clergy through the ſucceeding ages, and that it ſtill enriches the Romiſh church with its nutritious ſtreams.

[*x*] Lactantius, *Divinar. Inſtitutionum* lib. i. p. 164. Hesiodus, *Opp. et Dier.* ℣ 122. Compare with theſe, Sulpitius Severus, *Epiſt.* ii. p. 371. *Dial.* ii. cap. xiii. p. 474. *Dial.* iii. p. 512. Æneas Gazæus, *in Theophraſto*, p. 65. Macarius in Jac. Tollii *Inſignibus Itineris Italici*, p. 197. and other writers of this age.

[*y*] Clementina, *Homil.* x. p. 697. tom. i. *PP. Apoſtolic.* Arnobius, *Adv. Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 254. Casp. Barthius, *ad Rutilium Numantian.* p. 250.

[*z*] Prudentius Hymn. xi. *de Coronis*, p. 150, 151. Sulpitius Severus, *Ep.* i. p. 364. Æneas Gazæus, *in Theophraſto*, p. 173.

[*a*] See, particularly concerning this matter, Augustin, his book *de* viii *Quæſtionibus ad Dulcitium*, *N.* xiii. tom. vi. Opp. p. 128. *De fide et operibus*, cap. xvi. p. 182. *De fide, ſpe, et charitate*, § 118. p. 222. *Enarratione Pſal.* xxxv. § 3, &c.

Interpretations of ſcripture.

III. The interpretation of the Holy Scriptures employed fewer pens in this century than in the preceding age, in which the Chriſtian doctors were leſs involved in the labyrinths of controverſy. Yet, notwithſtanding the multiplication of religious diſputes, a conſiderable number of learned men undertook this uſeful and important taſk. We ſhall not mention thoſe who confined their illuſtrations to ſome one, or a few books of the divine word, ſuch as VICTOR of *Antioch*, POLYCHRONIUS, PHILO CARPATHIUS, ISIDORE of *Cordoua*, SALONIUS, and ANDREW of *Cæſarea*. We muſt not, however, paſs over in ſilence THEODORET and THEODORE, biſhops of *Cyrus* and *Mopſueſtia*, the two moſt famous expoſitors of this age, who illuſtrated a great part of the Holy Scriptures by their pious labours. They were truly eminent both in point of learning and genius; and, free and unprejudiced in their ſearch after truth, they followed the explications of ſcripture given by their predeceſſors, only as far as they found them agreeable to reaſon. The commentaries of THEODORET are yet extant, and in the hands of the learned [*b*]; thoſe of THEODORE are concealed in the eaſt among the Neſtorians, though on many accounts worthy to ſee the light [*c*]. CYRIL, of *Alexandria*, deſerves alſo a place among the commentators of this century; but a ſtill higher rank, among that uſeful and learned body, is due to ISIDORE of *Peluſium*, whoſe epiſtles contain many obſervations, which caſt a conſiderable degree of light upon ſeveral parts of ſcripture [*d*].

Many chimerical and weak commentators.

IV. It is, however, to be lamented, that the greateſt part of the commentators, both Greek and Latin, following the idle fancies of ORIGEN, overlooked the true and natural ſenſe of the words, and hunted after ſubtile and hidden ſignifications, for *myſteries* (as the Latins then termed them) in the plaineſt precepts of the Holy Scriptures. Several of the Greeks, and particularly THEODORET, laboured, with ſucceſs and preciſion, in illuſtrating the books of the New Teſtament; and their ſucceſs here is to be principally attributed to their perfect knowledge of the Greek language, which they had learned from their infancy. But neither the Greeks nor Latins caſt much light upon the Old Teſtament, which was cruelly tortured by the allegorical pens of almoſt all who attempted to illuſtrate and explain it. For nothing is more common, than to ſee the interpreters of the fifth century ſtraining all the paſſages of that ſacred book either to typify CHRIST, and the bleſſings of his kingdom, or Anti-chriſt, and the wars and deſolations, which he was to bring upon the earth, and that, without the laſt ſpark of judgment, or the ſmalleſt air of probability.

[*b*] See SIMON, *Hiſtoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. Teſt.* ch. xxii. p. 314; as alſo his *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſiaſt. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 180. [THEODORET wrote Commentaries upon the five books of *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, *Samuel*, *Kings*, *Chronicles*, the *Pſalms*, the *Canticles*, *Iſaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Baruch*, *Lamentations*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, the XII *leſſer Prophets*, and *St. Paul's* XIV *Epiſtles*.]

[*c*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatic.* tom. iii. § 2. p. 227. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſ. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 108. 677. [We are aſſured by FABRICIUS, upon the teſtimony of LAMBECIUS, that THEODORE's Commentary upon the XII *Prophets* is ſtill in being, in MSS. in the emperor's library at *Vienna*. See FABR. *Bibl. Græc.* tom. ix. p. 162. See alſo, for an ample and learned account of the writings of this author, LARDNER's *Credibility*, &c. vol. ix. p. 389.]

[*d*] See, for an account of theſe two authors, SIMON, *Hiſtoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Teſtament*, chap. xxi. p. 300.

Some of more wiſdom and judgment.

V. A few choſen ſpirits, ſuperior to the others in ſagacity and wiſdom, were bold enough to ſtand up againſt theſe critical deluſions, and to point out a ſafer and plainer way to divine truth. This we learn from the epiſtles of ISIDORE of *Peluſium*, who, though he was not himſelf entirely free from this allegorical contagion, yet cenſures judiciouſly, in many places, thoſe that abandoned the hiſtorical ſenſe of the Old Teſtament, and applied, univerſally, all its narrations and predictions to CHRIST alone. But none went greater lengths in cenſuring the fanciful followers of ORIGEN, than THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, who not only wrote a *book concerning allegory and hiſtory againſt* ORIGEN [*e*], but alſo, in his *commentary on the prophets*, did not heſitate to apply the moſt of their predictions to various events in ancient hiſtory [*f*]. This manner of interpreting ſcripture was very ill received, and contributed, perhaps, more to raiſe the general cry againſt him, than all the erroneous doctrines with which he was charged [*g*]. The Neſtorians followed the example of this remarkable and eminent man [*h*]; and ſtill continue to conſider him as a ſaint of the firſt order, and to preſerve his writings with the utmoſt care, as precious monuments of his piety and learning.

Didactic theology.

VI. The doctrines of religion were, at this time, underſtood and repreſented in a manner, that ſavoured little of their native purity and ſimplicity. They were drawn out by laboured commentaries beyond the terms in which the divine wiſdom had thought fit to reveal them; and were examined with that minuteneſs and ſubtilty that were only proper to cover them with obſcurity. And, what was ſtill worſe, the theological notions that generally prevailed, were proved rather by the authorities and logical diſcuſſions of the ancient doctors, than by the unerring dictates of the divine word. It does not appear that in this century any attempted to form a compleat ſyſtem of theology, unleſs we give that title to *ſix books of inſtruction*, which NICAEAS is ſaid to have compoſed for the uſe of the Neophytes [*i*]. But, as we already obſerved, the principal branches of religion were laboriouſly explained in the various books that were written againſt the Neſtorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

[*e*] FACUNDUS, *Hermianenſis de tribus Capitulis*, lib. iii. cap. vi. LIBERATUS *in Breviario*, cap. xxiv.

[*f*] *Acta Concilii Conſtantinopol.* II. *Seu Oecumenici* V. tom. iii. *Conciliorum*, p. 58. edit. Harduini.

[(*g*) THEODORE, after his death, was conſidered as the parent of the Pelagian and Neſtorian hereſies, though, during his life, he was held in the higheſt eſteem, and died in the communion of the church.]

[*h*] This appears by the teſtimony of COSMAS *Indicopleuſtes*, a writer of the ſixth century, who was, undoubtedly, a Neſtorian. For this author, in the fifth book of his *Chriſtian Topography*, which MONTFAUCON publiſhed in his new collection of the Greek fathers, maintains, that of all the Pſalms of DAVID, four only are applicable to CHRIST. And to confirm this his opinion, he affirms boldly, that the writers of the New Teſtament, when they apply to JESUS the prophecies of the old, do this rather by a mere accommodation of the words, without any regard to their true and genuine ſenſe.

[*i*] GENNADIUS *Maſſilienſis de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xxii. p. 28. edit. Fabric.

The managers of the controverſy againſt the Jews, Pagans, and Sectaries.

VII. The number of thoſe, who diſputed in this century againſt paganiſm and infidelity, was very conſiderable, yet not greater than the exigency of the times and the frequent attacks made upon Chriſtianity rendered neceſſary. THEODORET, in his ingenious and learned treatiſe, *De curandis Græcorum affectionibus*; ORIENTIUS, in his *Commonitorium*; and EVAGRIUS, in his *Diſpute between* ZACHAEUS *and* APOLLONIUS, oppoſed, with fortitude and vigour, thoſe that worſhiped images, and offered their religious ſervices to the Pagan deities [*k*]. To theſe we may add, PHILIP SEDETES and PHILOSTORGIUS, of whom the latter attacked PORPHYRY; and the former JULIAN. BASILIUS of *Seleucia*; GREGENTIUS, in his *Controverſy with* HERBANUS; and EVAGRIUS, in his *Dialogue between* THEOPHILUS *and* JUDÆUS, expoſed and refuted the errors and cavils of the Jews. VOCONIUS the African; SYAGRIUS, in his *Book concerning Faith*; GENNADIUS of *Marſeille*, who deſerves to be placed in the firſt rank; and THEODORET, in his *Treatiſe concerning the Fables of the Hereticks*, oppoſed all the different ſects; not to mention thoſe who wrote only againſt the errors of one or other particular party.

The defects of theſe diſputants.

VIII. Thoſe, who diſputed againſt the Chriſtian ſects, obſerved a moſt abſurd and vicious method of controverſy. They proceeded rather according to the rules of the ancient ſophiſts, and, what is ſtill more ſurprizing, according to the ſpirit of the *Roman law*, than by the examples and inſtructions of CHRIST and his apoſtles. In the Roman courts, matters of a difficult and doubtful nature were decided by the authority of certain aged lawyers, who were diſtinguiſhed by their abilities and experience. And when they happened to differ in opinion, the point was determined either by a plurality of voices, or by the ſentiments of the more learned and illuſtrious members of that venerable body [*l*]. This procedure of the Roman tribunals was, in this century, admitted as a ſtanding law, both in the deliberations of councils, and in the management of religious controverſy, to the great and unſpeakable detriment of truth. For by this, reaſon and even common ſenſe were, in ſome meaſure, excluded from every queſtion, and that was determined as *right* and *true*, which appeared ſuch to the greateſt number, or had been approved by doctors of the greateſt note in preceding times. The *acts* of the various *councils*, which are yet extant, manifeſtly ſhew that this was the caſe. And this circumſtance, combined with what we have already obſerved with reſpect to the diſputants of the age now under conſideration, make it eaſy for us to imagine the various defects that muſt have prevailed in the methods of defending truth, and oppoſing error.

Spurious writings.

IX. This abſurd imitation of the Roman law in the management of religious controverſy, this prepoſterous method of deciding truth by human authorities, were fruitful ſources of ſpurious and ſuppoſititious productions.

[*k*] See, for an account of ORIENTIUS and EVAGRIUS, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 121 and 252.

[*l*] See the *Codex Theodoſ.* lib. i. tit. iv. *De reſponſis prudentum*, p. 32, edit. Ritterian.

For many audacious impoſtors were hence encouraged to publiſh their own writings under the names of ancient Chriſtian worthies, nay, under the ſacred names of, even, CHRIST himſelf and his holy apoſtles; that thus, in the deliberations of councils, and in the courſe of controverſy, they might have authorities to oppoſe to authorities in defence of their reſpective opinions. The whole Chriſtian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with theſe infamous cheats, theſe ſpurious productions. This is ſaid to have engaged GELASIUS, the Roman pontif, to call together a council, compoſed of the biſhops of the Latin church, in which aſſembly, after a ſtrict examination of thoſe writings which appeared under great and venerable names, the famous decree paſſed, that deprived ſo many *apocryphal* books of their borrowed authority. That ſomething of this kind really happened, it would be, perhaps, an inſtance of temerity to deny: but many learned men aſſert, that the decree attributed to GELASIUS, labours under the ſame inconveniency with the books which it condemns, and was, by no means, the production of that pontif, but of ſome deceiver, who uſurped clandeſtinely his name and authority [*m*].

Moral writers.

X. EUCHERIUS, SALVIAN, and NILUS, ſhine with a ſuperior luſtre among the moral writers of this century. The epiſtle of EUCHERIUS, *concerning the Contempt of the World, and the ſecular Philoſophy*, is an excellent performance both in point of matter and ſtyle. The works of MARK the hermit breathe a ſpirit of fervent piety, but are highly defective in many reſpects. The matter is ill choſen, and it is treated without order, perſpicuity, or force of reaſoning. FASTIDIUS compoſed ſeveral diſcourſes concerning moral duties, but they have not ſurvived the ruins of time. The works, that are yet extant, of DIADOCHUS, PROSPER, and SEVERIAN, are extremely pleaſing on account of the ſolidity and elegance which are to be found, for the moſt part, in their moral ſentences, though they afford but indifferent entertainment to ſuch as are deſirous of preciſion, method, and ſound argumentation. And indeed this want of method in the diſtribution and arrangement of their matter, and a conſtant neglect of tracing their ſubject to its firſt principles, are defects common to almoſt all the moral writers of this century.

XI. Had this, indeed, been their only defect, the candid and impartial would have ſupported it with patience, and attributed it charitably to the infelicity of the times. But many of the writers and teachers of this age did unſpeakable injury to the cauſe of true piety by their crude and enthuſiaſtic inventions. The Myſtics, who pretended to higher degrees of perfection than other Chriſtians, drew every where to their party, particularly in the eaſtern provinces, a vaſt number of the ignorant and inconſiderate multitude, by the triking appearance of their auſtere and ſingular piety. It is impoſſible to deſcribe the rigour and ſeverity of the laws which theſe ſenſeleſs fanatics impoſed upon themſelves, in order, as they alleged, to appeaſe the deity, and to deliver the *celeſtial ſpirit* from the bondage of this *mortal body*. They not only lived among the wild beaſts, but alſo lived after the manner of theſe ſavage animals; they ran naked through the lonely deſarts with a furious aſpect, and with all the agitations of madneſs and frenzy; they prolonged the life of their emaciated bodies by the wretched nouriſhment of graſs and wild herbs, avoided the ſight and converſation of men, remained motionleſs in certain places for ſeveral years, expoſed to the rigour and inclemency of the ſeaſons, and towards the concluſion of their lives ſhut themſelves up in narrow and miſerable huts; and all this was conſidered as true piety, the only acceptable method of worſhiping the deity, and rendering him propitious [*n*]. The greateſt part of the Myſtics were led into the abſurdities of this extravagant diſcipline, not ſo much by the pretended force of reaſon and argument, as by a natural propenſity to ſolitude, a gloomy and melancholy caſt of mind, and an implicit and blind ſubmiſſion to the authority and examples of others. For the diſeaſes of the mind, as well as thoſe of the body, are generally contagious, and no peſtilence ſpreds its infection with a more dreadful rapidity than ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm. Several perſons have committed to writing the precepts of this ſevere diſcipline, and reduced its abſurdities into a ſort of ſyſtem, ſuch as JULIANUS POMERIUS among the Latins [*o*], and many, among the Syrians, whoſe names it is needleſs to mention.

[*m*] PEARSONUS, *Vindiciar. Ignatianar.* part. I. cap. iv. p. 189. CAVE, *Hiſtor. Litter. criptor. Eccleſiaſ.* p. 260. URB. GODOFR. SIBERUS, *Præfat. ad Enchiridion Sexti*, p. 79.

The ſuperſtition of the Stilites.

XII. Of all the inſtances of ſuperſtitious frenzy that diſgraced this age, none was held in higher veneration, or excited more the wonder of the multitude, than that of a certain order of men, who were called Stilites by the Greeks, and Sancti Columnares, or Pillar-Saints, by the Latins. Theſe were perſons of a moſt ſingular and extravagant turn of mind, who ſtood motionleſs upon the tops of *pillars*, expreſly raiſed for this exerciſe of their patience, and remained there for ſeveral years, amidſt the admiration and applauſe of the ſtupid populace. The inventor of this ſtrange and ridiculous diſcipline was SIMEON, a Syrian, who began his follies by changing the agreeable employment of a ſhepherd, for the ſenſeleſs auſterities of the monkiſh life. But his enthuſiaſm carried him ſtill greater lengths; for, in order to climb as near heaven as he could, he paſſed thirty-ſeven years of his wretched life upon five pillars of ſix, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-ſix, and forty cubits high, and thus acquired a moſt ſhining reputation and attracted the veneration of all about him [*p*]. Many of the inhabitants of *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, ſeduced by a falſe ambition, and an utter ignorance of true religion, followed the example of this fanatic, though not with the ſame degree of auſterity [*q*]. And, what is

---

[*n*] See the *Pratum Spiritule* of MOSCHUS; the *Lauſiac Hiſtory of* PALLADIUS; as alſo SULPITIUS SEVERUS, *Dial.* i.

[(*o*) POMERIUS wrote a treatiſe, *De vita Contemplativa*, in which the doctrines and precepts of the myſtics were carefully collected.]

[*p*] See the *Acta Sanctorum Menſis Januarii*, tom. i. p. 261—277. where the reader will fin the account we have given of this whimſical diſcipline. THEODORET, indeed, had befor given ſeveral hints of it, alleging, among other things, that SIMEON had gradually added t the height of his pillar, with a deſign to approach, by this means, nearer to heaven. Se TILLEMONT, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. xv. p. 347. edit. Paris. See alſ the *Acts* of SIMEON *the Stylite*, in STEPH. EUODII ASSEMANNI *Actis Martyrum*, *Orient.* *Occident.* vol. ii. p. 227. publiſhed at *Rome*, in folio, in the year 1748.

[(*q*) The learned FREDERIC SPANHEIM, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (p. 1154.) ſpeaks of ſecond SIMEON the Stylite (mentioned by EVAGRIUS (*Hiſt.* lib. vi. cap. 23.) who lived in th almoſ almoſt incredible, this ſuperſtitious practice continued in vogue until the twelfth century, when however it was, at length, totally ſuppreſſed [*r*].

The Latins had too much wiſdom and prudence to imitate the Syrians and Orientals in this whimſical ſuperſtition. And when a certain fanatic or impoſtor, named WULFILAICUS, erected one of theſe pillars in the country of *Treves*, and propoſed living upon it after the manner of SIMEON; the neighbouring biſhops ordered it to be pulled down, and thus nipped this ſpecies of ſuperſtition in the bud [*s*].

Further defects of the public inſtructors, and practical writers.

XIII. The Myſtic rules of diſcipline and manners had a bad effect upon the moral writers, and thoſe who were ſet apart for the inſtruction of Chriſtians. Thus in inſtructing the catechumens and others, they were more diligent and zealous in inculcating a regard for the external parts of religion, and an attachment to bodily exerciſe, than in forming the heart and the affections to inward piety and ſolid virtue. Nay, they went ſo far, as to preſcribe rules of ſanctity and virtue little different from the unnatural rigour and fanatical piety of the Myſtics. SALVIAN, and other celebrated writers, gave it as their opinion, that none were truly and perfectly holy, but thoſe who abandoned all riches and honours, abſtained from matrimony, baniſhed all joy and chearfulneſs from their hearts, and macerated their bodies with various ſorts of torments and mortifications. And as all could not ſupport ſuch exceſſive degrees of ſeverity, thoſe madmen, or fanatics, whoſe robuſt conſtitutions and ſavage tempers were the beſt adapted to this kind of life, were diſtinguiſhed by the public applauſe, and ſaw their influence and authority increaſe daily. And thus ſaints ſtarted up like muſhrooms in almoſt every place.

The controverſy between Jerome and Vigilantius.

XIV. A few choice ſpirits boldly attempted to pluck up the roots of this growing ſuperſtition, and to bring back the deluded multitude from this vain and chimerical diſcipline to the practice of ſolid and genuine piety. But the votaries of ſuperſtition, who were ſuperior in number, reputation, and authority, reduced them ſoon to ſilence, and rendered their noble and pious efforts utterly ineffectual [*t*]. We have an example of this in the caſe of VIGILANTIUS, a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, who was born in *Gaul*, and went from thence to *Spain*, where he performed the functions of a preſbyter. This eccleſiaſtic, on his return, from a voyage he had made into *Paleſtine* and *Egypt*, began, about the beginning of this century, to propagate ſeveral doctrines, and to publiſh repeated exhortations quite oppoſite to the opinions and manners of the times. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs, were to be honoured with any ſort of homage or worſhip; and therefore cenſured the pilgrimages that were made to places, that were

---

ſixth century. This ſecond fanatic ſeems to have carried his auſterities ſtill further than the chief of the ſect; for he remained upon his pillar ſixty-eight years, and from thence, like the firſt SIMEON, he taught, or rather deluded, the gazing multitude, declamed againſt hereſy, pretended to caſt out devils, to heal diſeaſes, and to foretel future events.]

[*r*] See URB. GODOFR. SIBERI *Diſſ. de Sanctis Columnaribus*. CAROLI MAJELLI *Diſſ. de Stylitis*, publiſhed in ASSEMANNI *Acti Martyr. Orient. et Occident*. tom. ii. p. 246. where may be ſeen a copper-plate print of SIMEON's pillar.

[*s*] GREGOR. TURONENS. *Hiſtor. Francor.* lib. viii. cap. xv. p. 387.

[*t*] AUGUSTIN complains of this in his famous epiſtle to JANUARIUS, N° 119.

reputed holy. He turned into deriſion the prodigies which were ſaid to be wrought in the temples conſecrated to martyrs, and condemned the cuſtom of performing vigils in them. He aſſerted, and indeed with reaſon, that the cuſtom of burning tapers at the tombs of the martyrs in broad day, was imprudently borrowed from the ancient ſuperſtition of the Pagans. He maintained, moreover, that prayers addreſſed to departed ſaints were void of all efficacy; and treated with contempt faſting, and mortifications, the celibacy of the clergy, and the various auſterities of the monaſtic life. And, finally, he affirmed, that the conduct of thoſe, who, diſtributing their ſubſtance among the indigent, ſubmitted to the hardſhips of a voluntary poverty, or ſent a part of their treaſures to *Jeruſalem* for devout purpoſes, had nothing in it acceptable to the deity.

There were, among the Gallic and Spaniſh biſhops, ſeveral that reliſhed the opinions of VIGILANTIUS. But JEROME, the great monk of the age, aſſailed this bold reformer of religion with ſuch bitterneſs and fury, that the honeſt preſbyter ſoon found that nothing but his ſilence could preſerve his life from the intemperate rage of bigotry and ſuperſtition. This project then of reforming the corruptions, which a fanatical and ſuperſtitious zeal had introduced into the church, was choked in its birth [u]. And the name of good VIGILANTIUS remains ſtill in the *liſt of heretics*, which is acknowledged as authentic by thoſe, who, without any regard to their own judgment or the declarations of ſcripture, followed blindly the deciſions of antiquity.

Diſputes about Origeniſm.

XV. The controverſies, which had been raiſed in *Egypt*, concerning ORIGEN and his doctrine, towards the concluſion of the preceding century, were now renewed at *Conſtantinople*, and carried on without either decency or prudence. The Nitrian monks, baniſhed from *Egypt*, on account of their attachment to ORIGEN, took refuge at *Conſtantinople*, and were treated, by JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, the biſhop of that city, with clemency and benignity. This no ſooner came to the knowledge of THEOPHILUS, patriarch of *Alexandria*, than he formed a perfidious project againſt the eloquent prelate; and ſent the famous EPIPHANIUS, with ſeveral other biſhops, to *Conſtantinople*, to compaſs his fall, and deprive him of his epiſcopal dignity. No time could be more favourable for the execution of this project, than that in which it was formed; for CHRYSOSTOM, by his auſterity, and his vehement declamations againſt the vices of the people and the corrupt manners of the ladies of the court, had incurred the diſpleaſure of many, and had alſo excited, in a more particular manner, the reſentment and indignation of the empreſs EUDOXIA, wife of *Arcadius*. This violent princeſs ſent for THEOPHILUS and the Egyptian biſhops, who, purſuant to her orders, repaired to *Conſtantinople*; and, having called a council, inquired into the religious ſentiments of CHRYSOSTOM, and examined his morals, and the whole courſe of his conduct and converſation with the utmoſt ſeverity. This council, which was held in the ſuburbs of *Chalcedon*, in the year 403, with THEOPHILUS at its head, declared

---

[u] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article VIGILANTIUS. BARBEYRAC, *De la Morale des Peres*, p. 252. GERHAR. JO. VOSSIUS, *Theſibus Hiſtorico-Theologicis*, p. 170. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 57.

CHRYSOSTOM unworthy of his high rank in the church, on account of the favourable manner in which he ſtood diſpoſed towards ORIGEN and his followers; and, in conſequence of this decree, condemned him to baniſhment. The people of *Conſtantinople*, who were tenderly attached to their pious and worthy biſhop, roſe in a tumultuous manner, and prevented the execution of this unrighteous ſentence [*w*]. When this tumult was entirely huſhed, the ſame unrelenting judges, in order to ſatisfy their vindictive rage and that of EUDOXIA, renewed their ſentence, the year following, under another pretext [*x*], and with more ſucceſs; for the pious CHRYSOSTOM, yielding to the redoubled efforts of his enemies, was baniſhed to *Cucuſus*, a city of *Cilicia*, where he died about three years after [*y*].

The exile of this illuſtrious man was followed by a terrible ſedition of the Johanniſts (ſo his votaries were called) which was calmed, though with much difficulty, by the edicts of ARCADIUS [*z*]. It is beyond all doubt, that the proceedings againſt CHRYSOSTOM were cruel and unjuſt; in this, however, he was to blame, that he aſſumed the authority and rank which had been granted, by the council of *Conſtantinople*, to the biſhops of that imperial city, and ſet himſelf up as a judge of the controverſy between THEOPHILUS and the Egyptian monks, which the Alexandrian prelate could not behold without the utmoſt impatience and reſentment. Theſe monks, when they loſt their protector, were reſtored to the favour of THEOPHILUS; but the faction of the Origeniſts continued, notwithſtanding all this, to flouriſh in *Egypt*, *Syria*, and the adjacent countries, and held their chief reſidence at *Jeruſalem*.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies greatly multiplied.

I. TO enumerate the rites and inſtitutions that were added, in this century, to the Chriſtian worſhip, would require a volume of a conſiderable ſize. The *acts of councils*, and the records left us by the moſt celebrated ancient writers, are the ſources from whence the curious may draw a ſatiſfactory and particular account of this matter; and to theſe we refer ſuch as are deſirous of ſomething more than a general view of the ſubject under

---

[(*w*) This is not quite exact. For it appears, by the accounts of the beſt hiſtorians, that this ſentence was really executed, and that the emperor confirmed the decree of this firſt ſynod, by baniſhing CHRYSOSTOM into *Bythinia*; or, as others allege, by ordering him to retire to the country. A violent earthquake and a terrible ſhower of hail, which were looked upon by the multitude as judgments occaſioned by the unrighteous perſecution of their pious biſhop, alarmed the court, and engaged them to recal CHRYSOSTOM to his office.]

[(*x*) This new pretext was the indecent manner, in which CHRYSOSTOM is ſaid to have declaimed againſt EUDOXIA, on account of her having erected her ſtatue in ſilver near the church.]

[*y*] See TILLEMONT and HERMANT, who have both written the life of CHRYSOSTOM; as alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS.

[*z*] See CYRILLI *vita Sabæ* in COTELERII *Monument. Eccleſ. Græc.* tom. ii. p. 274. JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 31.

conſideration. Several of theſe ancient writers, uncorrupted by the contagious examples of the times in which they lived, have ingenuouſly acknowledged that true piety and virtue were ſmothered, as it were, under that enormous burthen of ceremonies under which they lay groaning in this century. This evil was owing partly to the ignorance and diſhoneſty of the clergy; partly to the calamities of the times which were extremely unfavourable to the purſuit of knowledge, and to the culture of the mind; and partly, indeed, to the natural depravity of imperfect mortals, who are much more diſpoſed to worſhip with the eye, than with the heart, and are more ready to offer to the deity the laborious pomp of an outward ſervice, than the nobler, yet ſimple oblation of pious diſpoſitions and holy affections.

A general view of the new rites introduced at this time.

II. Divine worſhip was now daily riſing from one degree of pomp to another, and degenerating more and more into a gaudy ſpectacle only proper to attract the ſtupid admiration of a gazing populace. The ſacerdotal garments were embelliſhed with a variety of ornaments, with a view to excite in the minds of the multitude a greater veneration for the ſacred order. New acts of devotion were alſo celebrated. In *Gaul*, particularly, the ſolemn *prayers* and *ſupplications*, which uſually precede the anniverſary of CHRIST's aſcenſion, were now inſtituted for the firſt time [a]. In other places perpetual acclamations of praiſe to God were performed both night and day by ſingers who ſucceeded each other, ſo as that the ſervice ſuffered no interruption [b]; as if the ſupreme being took pleaſure in ſuch noiſy and turbulent ſhouting, or received any gratification from the blandiſhments of men. The riches and magnificence of the churches exceeded all bounds [c]. They were alſo adorned with coſtly images, among which, in conſequence of the Neſtorian controverſy, that of the Virgin MARY, holding the child JESUS in her arms, obtained the firſt and principal place. The altars and the cheſts, in which the relicks were preſerved, were in moſt places made of ſolid ſilver. And from this we may eaſily imagine, the ſplendor and expenſes that were laviſhed upon the other utenſils which were employed in the ſervice of the church.

The feaſts of charity.

III. On the other hand, the *agapæ*, or *feaſts of charity*, were now ſuppreſſed, on account of the abuſes to which they gave occaſion amidſt the daily decline of that piety and virtue, which rendered theſe meetings uſeful and edifying in the primitive ages.

Penitents.

A new method alſo of proceeding with *penitents* was introduced into the Latin church. For grievous offenders, who had formerly been obliged to confeſs their guilt in the face of the congregation, were now delivered from this mortifying penalty, and obtained, from LEO the GREAT, a permiſſion to *confeſs* their crimes *privately* to a prieſt appointed for that purpoſe. By this change of the ancient diſcipline, one of the greateſt reſtraints upon licentiouſneſs, and the only remaining barrier of chaſtity, were entirely removed, and the actions of Chriſtians were ſubject to no other ſcrutiny than that of the clergy; a change, which was frequently convenient for the ſinner, and alſo advantageous in many reſpects to the ſacred order.

---

[a] See SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, *Epiſt.* lib. v. *epiſt.* xvi. lib. vi. *epiſt.* i; as alſo MARTENE, *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. v. p. 47.

[b] GERVAIS, *Hiſtoire de Suger*, tom. i. p. 23.

[c] See ZACHARIAS of *Mitylene*, *De opificio Mundi*, p. 165, 166.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diſſenſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Ancient hereſies revived.

I. SEVERAL of thoſe ſects, which had divided the church in the preceding ages, renewed their efforts, at this time, to propagate their reſpective opinions, and introduced new tumults and animoſities among the Chriſtians. We ſhall ſay nothing of the Novatians, Marcionites, and Manicheans, thoſe inauſpicious and fatal names that diſgrace the earlier annals of the church, though it is evident, that as yet their ſects ſubſiſted, and were even numerous in many places. We ſhall confine ourſelves to an account of the Donatiſts and Arians, who were the peſts of the preceding century.

The Donatiſts.

The Donatiſts had hitherto maintained themſelves with a ſucceſsful obſtinacy, and their affairs were in a good ſtate. But about the beginning of this century, the face of things changed much to their diſadvantage, by the means of St. AUGUSTIN, biſhop of *Hippo*. The Catholic biſhops of *Africa*, animated by the exhortations, and conducted by the counſels of this zealous prelate, exerted themſelves with the utmoſt vigour in the deſtruction of this ſeditious ſect, whom they juſtly looked upon, not only as troubleſome to the church by their obſtinacy, but alſo as a nuiſance to the ſtate by the brutal ſoldiery [d] which they employed in their cauſe. Accordingly, deputies were ſent, in the year 404, from the council of *Carthage* to the emperor HONORIUS, to requeſt, that the laws enacted againſt heretics, by the preceding emperors, might have force againſt the Donatiſts, who denied that they belonged to the heretical tribe; and alſo to deſire, that bounds might be ſet to the barbarous fury of the Circumcelliones. The firſt ſtep that the emperor took in conſequence of this requeſt, was to impoſe a fine upon all the Donatiſts, who refuſed to return into the boſom of the church, and to ſend their biſhops and doctors into baniſhment. The year following, new laws, much ſeverer than the former, were enacted againſt this rebellious ſect, under the title of *Acts of Uniformity*. And as the magiſtrates were remiſs in the execution of them, the council of *Carthage*, in the year 407, ſent a ſecond time deputies to the emperor, to deſire that certain perſons might be appointed to execute theſe *edicts* with vigour and impartiality; and their requeſt was granted.

II. The faction of the Donatiſts, though much broke by theſe repeated ſhocks, was yet far from being totally extinguiſhed. It recovered a part of its ſtrength in the year 408, after that STILICHO had been put to death by the order of HONORIUS; and gained a ſtill further acceſſion of vigour the year following, in which the emperor publiſhed a law in favour of liberty of conſcience, and prohibited all compulſion in matters of religion. This law,

[d] The *Circumcelliones* already mentioned.

however, was not of long duration. It was abrogated at the earneſt and repeated ſollicitations of the council, which was held at *Carthage* in the year 410; and MARCELLINUS the tribune was ſent by HONORIUS into *Africa*, with full power to bring to a concluſion this tedious and unhappy conteſt. MARCELLINUS therefore held at *Carthage*, in the year 411, a ſolemn *conference*, in which he examined the cauſe with much attention, heard the contending parties during the ſpace of three days; and, at length, pronounced ſentence in favour of the Catholics [e]. The Catholic biſhops, who were preſent at this conference, were 286 in number; and thoſe of the Donatiſts 279. The latter, upon their defeat, appealed to the emperor, but without effect. The glory of their defeat was due to AUGUSTIN, who bore the principal part in this controverſy, and who, indeed, by his writings, counſels, and admonitions, governed almoſt the whole *African* church, and alſo the principal and moſt illuſtrious heads of that extenſive province.

III. By this conference, the party of the Donatiſts was greatly weakened; nor could they ever get the better of this terrible ſhock, though the face of affairs changed afterwards in a manner that was proper to revive their hopes. The greateſt part of them, through the fear of puniſhment, ſubmitted to the emperor's decree, and returned into the boſom of the church; while the ſevereſt penalties were inflicted upon thoſe who remained obſtinate and perſiſted in their rebellion. Fines, baniſhment, confiſcation of goods, were the ordinary puniſhments of the obſtinate Donatiſts; and even the pain of death was inflicted upon ſuch as ſurpaſſed the reſt in perverſeneſs, and were the ſeditious ringleaders of that ſtubborn faction. Some avoided theſe penalties by flight, others by concealing themſelves, and ſome were ſo deſperate as to ſeek deliverance by ſelf-murther, to which the Donatiſts had a ſhocking propenſity. In the mean time, the Circumcelliones uſed more violent methods of warding off the execution of the ſentence that was pronounced againſt their ſect; for they ran up and down through the province of *Africa* in the moſt outrageous manner, committing acts of cruelty every where, and defending themſelves by force of arms.

The Donatiſts, indeed, recovered afterwards their former liberty and tranquillity by the ſuccour and protection they received from the Vandals, who invaded *Africa*, with GENSERIC at their head, in the year 427, and took this province out of the hands of the Romans. The wound, however, that this ſect had received from the vigorous execution of the imperial laws, was ſo deep, that though they began to revive and multiply by the aſſiſtance of the Vandals, yet they could never arrive at their former ſtrength and luſtre.

---

[e] See FRANC. BALDUIN, *Hiſt. Collationis Carthag.* in OPTAT. *Milev. Pinian.* p. 337. It is proper to obſerve here, that this *meeting*, held by MARCELLINUS, is very improperly termed a *conference* (*collatio*). For there was no diſpute carried on at this meeting between the Catholics and the Donatiſts; nor did any of the parties endeavour to gain or defeat the other by ſuperiority of argument. This conference then was properly a *judicial trial*, in which MARCELLINUS was, by the emperor, appointed judge, or arbiter, of this religious controverſy, and accordingly pronounced ſentence after a proper hearing of the cauſe. It appears, therefore, from this event, that the notion of a ſupreme ſpiritual judge of controverſy and ruler of the church, appointed by CHRIST, had not as yet entered into any one's head; ſince we ſee the African biſhops themſelves appealing to the emperor in the preſent religious queſtion.

The ſtate of the Arians.

IV. The Arians, oppreſſed and perſecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among thoſe fierce and ſavage nations, who were gradually overturning the weſtern empire, and found among the Goths, Suevi, Heruli, Vandals, and Burgundians a fixed reſidence and a peaceful retreat. And as their ſecurity animated their courage, they treated the Catholics with the ſame violence which the latter had employed againſt them and other heretics; and they perſecuted and vexed in various ways ſuch as profeſſed their adherence to the Nicene doctrines. The Vandals, who reigned in *Africa*, ſurpaſſed all the other ſavage nations in barbarity and injuſtice towards the Catholics. The kings of this fierce people, particularly GENSERIC and HUNERIC his ſon, pulled down the churches of thoſe Chriſtians who acknowledged the divinity of CHRIST, ſent their biſhops into exile, and maimed and tormented in various ways ſuch as were nobly firm and inflexible in the profeſſion of their faith [*f*]. They however declared, that, in uſing theſe ſevere and violent methods, they were authorized by the example of the emperors who had enacted laws of the ſame rigorous nature againſt the Donatiſts, the Arians and other ſects who differed in opinion from the Chriſtians of *Conſtantinople* [*g*].

We muſt not here omit mentioning the ſtupendous miracle which is ſaid to have been wrought during theſe perſecutions in *Africa*; and by which the ſupreme being is ſuppoſed to have declared his diſpleaſure againſt the Arians, and his favour towards their adverſaries. This miracle conſiſted in enabling thoſe Catholics, whoſe tongues had been cut out by the Arian tyrant HUNERIC, to ſpeak diſtinctly, and to proclaim aloud the divine majeſty of the Saviour of the world. This remarkable fact can ſcarcely be denied, ſince it is ſupported by the teſtimony of the moſt credible and reſpectable witneſſes [*h*]; but whether it is to be attributed to a ſupernatural and miraculous power, is a matter not ſo eaſily decided, and which admits of much diſpute [*i*].

[*f*] See VICTOR. VITENS. lib. iii. *De perſequutione Vandalica*, which THEOD. RUINART publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1694, in 8^{vo}, with his *Hiſtory* of the ſame perſecution.

[*g*] See the edict of HUNERIC in the hiſtory of VICTOR, mentioned in the preceding note, lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 64.

[*h*] Theſe witneſſes, who had, themſelves, ocular demonſtration of the fact, were VICTOR of *Utica*, ÆNEAS of *Gaza* (who examined the mouths of the perſons in queſtion, and found that their tongues were entirely rooted out) PROCOPIUS, MARCELLINUS the count, and the emperor JUSTINIAN. Upon the authority of ſuch reſpectable teſtimonies, the learned ABBADIE formed a laboured and dexterous defence of the miraculous nature of this extraordinary fact in his work, intitled, *La Triomphe de la Providence*, &c. vol. iii. p. 255, &c. where all the fire of his zeal, and all the ſubtilty of his logic, ſeem to have been exhauſted. Dr. BERRIMAN, in his *Hiſtorical account of the Trinitarian Controverſy*; as alſo in his ſermons preached at lady MOYER's lectures, in the year 1725; and Dr. CHAPMAN, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, have maintained the ſame hypotheſis. To the former, an anſwer was publiſhed by an anonymous writer, under the following title, *An Enquiry into the Miracle ſaid to have been wrought in the fifth century, upon ſome orthodox Chriſtians in favour of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, &c. *in a Letter to a Friend*. We may venture to ſay, that this anſwer is utterly unſatisfactory. The author of it, after having laboured to invalidate the teſtimony alleged in favour of the fact, ſeems himſelf ſcarcely convinced by his own arguments; for he acknowledges at laſt the poſſibility of the event, but perſiſts in denying the miracle, and ſuppoſes, that the cruel operation was ſo imperfectly performed upon theſe confeſſors, as to leave in ſome of them ſuch a ſhare of that organ, as was ſufficient for the uſe of ſpeech. Dr. MIDDLETON (to whom ſome have attributed the

---

forementioned *Anſwer)* maintains the ſame hypotheſis, in his *Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers*, &c. ſuppoſing, that the tongues of the perſons in queſtion were not entirely rooted out, which he corroborates by the following conſideration, that two of the ſufferers are ſaid to have utterly loſt the faculty of ſpeaking. For though this be aſcribed to a peculiar judgment of God puniſhing the immoralities, of which they were afterwards guilty, yet this appears to the doctor, *to be a forced and improbable ſolution of the matter*, who imagines he ſolves it better by ſuppoſing, *that they had not been deprived of their intire tongues.* He goes yet further, and produces two caſes from the Memoirs of the academy of ſciences at *Paris*, which prove, in his opinion, "That this pretended miracle owed its whole credit to our ignorance of the powers of "nature." The firſt is, that of *a girl born without a tongue, who yet talked as eaſily and diſtinctly, as if he ſhe had enjoyed the full benefit of that organ*; and the ſecond, that of *a boy, who, at the age of eight or nine years, loſt his tongue by a gangrene or ulcer, and yet retained the faculty of ſpeaking.* See MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c. p. 183, 184.

This reaſoning of the ſceptical doctor of divinity appeared ſuperficial and unſatisfactory to the judicious Mr. DODWELL, who (ſaying nothing about the caſe of the two trinitarians who remained dumb, after their tongues were cut out, and whoſe dumbneſs is but indifferently accounted for by their immorality, ſince *gifts* have been often poſſeſſed without *graces)* confines himſelf to the conſideration of the two parallel facts drawn from the *Academical Memoirs* already mentioned. To ſhew that theſe facts prove little or nothing againſt the miracle in queſtion, he juſtly obſerves, that though in one or two particular caſes a mouth may be ſo ſingularly formed as to utter articulate ſounds, without the uſual inſtrument of ſpeech (ſome excreſcence probably ſupplying the defect) yet it cannot be any thing leſs than miraculous, that this ſhould happen to a conſiderable number of perſons, whoſe tongues were cut out to prevent their preaching a diſcountenanced doctrine. To deny the miracle in queſtion, we muſt maintain, that it is as eaſy to ſpeak without a tongue, as with it. See Mr. DODWELL's *Free Anſwer to Dr.* MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry*, &c. p. 96, 97, &c.

Mr. TOLL, who defended MIDDLETON's Hypotheſis, has propoſed an objection *à priori*, as it may be juſtly called, againſt the truth of this miracle. He obſerves, that the occaſion on which it was wrought was not of ſufficient *conſequence* or *neceſſity* to require a divine interpoſition; for it was not wrought to convert infidels to Chriſtianity, but to bring over the followers of ARIUS to the Athanaſian faith; it was wrought, in a word, for the explication of a doctrine, which both ſides allowed to be founded in the New Teſtament. Now, as the Holy Scriptures are a revelation of the will of God, "It ſeems (ſays Mr. TOLL) to caſt a reflexion on his wiſ"dom, as if he did things by halves, to ſuppoſe it neceſſary for him to work miracles, in order "to aſcertain the ſenſe of thoſe ſcriptures. This (continues he) would be multiplying miracles "to an infinite degree;—beſides, it would deſtroy the univerſal truth of that propoſition from "which we cannot depart, namely, *That the ſcriptures are ſufficiently plain in all things neceſſary* "*to ſalvation.*" See Mr. TOLL's *Defence of Dr.* MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry againſt Mr.* DODWELL's *Free Anſwer*, p. 81, 82. To this ſpecious objection Mr. DODWELL replies, that on the doctrine in diſpute between the Arians and the Orthodox depend the true notion, as well as the importance and reality of our ſalvation; that the doctrines, duties, and motives of Chriſtianity are *exalted* or *debaſed*, as we embrace the one or the other of thoſe ſyſtems; that on the *divinity* of CHRIST, the *meritoriouſneſs* of the propitiation offered by him muſt entirely reſt, and that, therefore, no occaſion of greater conſequence can be aſſigned on which a miracle might be expected. He adds, that the diſputes which men have raiſed about certain doctrines, are no proof that theſe doctrines are not plainly revealed in ſcripture, ſeeing this would prove that no truth is there ſufficiently revealed, becauſe, at one time or other, they have been all diſputed; and he obſerves judiciouſly, that the expediency of interpoſing by miracles, is what we are not always competent judges of, ſince God only knows the times, ſeaſons, and occaſions, in which it is proper to alter the uſual courſe of nature in order to maintain the truth, to ſupport the oppreſſed, and to carry on the great purpoſes of his goſpel-kingdom. It is enough, that the preſent interpoſition be not *incredible* to remove Mr. TOLL's objection, without conſidering its particular uſe and the unexceptionable manner in which it is atteſted. See Mr. DODWELL's *Full and final reply to Mr.* TOLL's *Defence*, &c. p. 270, 271.

We muſt obſerve here, that this latter objection and anſwer are merely hypothetical, *i.e.* they

The riſe of Neſtorianiſm.

V. A new ſect, which was the ſource of moſt fatal and deplorable diviſions in the Chriſtian church, was formed by NESTORIUS, a Syrian, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, a diſciple of the celebrated THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, and a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, which were, however, accompanied with much levity and with intolerable arrogance. Before we enter into a particular account of the doctrine of this ſectary, it is proper to obſerve, that, though by the decrees of former councils, it had been clearly and peremptorily determined that CHRIST was, at the ſame time, true God and true man; yet no council had hitherto decreed any thing concerning the *manner* and *effect* of this union of the two natures in the divine Saviour; nor was this matter, as yet, become a ſubject either of inquiry or diſpute among Chriſtians. The conſequence of this was, that the Chriſtian doctors expreſſed themſelves differently concerning this myſtery. Some uſed ſuch forms of expreſſion as ſeemed to widen the difference between the ſon of God and the ſon of man, and thus to divide the nature of CHRIST into two diſtinct perſons. Others, on the contrary, ſeemed to confound too much the ſon of God with the ſon of man; and to ſuppoſe the nature of CHRIST *compoſed* of his divinity and humanity blended together into one.

The hereſy of APOLLINARIS had given occaſion to theſe different ways of ſpeaking. For he maintained that the man CHRIST was not endowed with a human ſoul, but with the divine nature which was ſubſtituted in its place, and performed its functions; and this doctrine manifeſtly ſuppoſed a *confuſion* of the two natures in the MESSIAH. The Syrian doctors therefore, that they might avoid the errors of APOLLINARIS, and exclude his followers from the communion of the church, were careful in eſtabliſhing an accurate diſtinction between the divine and the human nature in the ſon of God; and for this purpoſe they uſed ſuch forms of expreſſion as ſeemed to favour the notion of CHRIST's being compoſed of two *diſtinct perſons*. The manner of ſpeaking, adopted by the Alexandrians and Egyptians, had a different tendency, and ſeemed to countenance the doctrine of APOLLINARIS, and by a *confuſion* of the *two natures* to blend them into *one*. NESTORIUS, who was a Syrian, and had adopted the ſentiments of the doctors of his nation, was a violent enemy to all the ſects; but to none ſo much as to the Apollinarian faction, after whoſe ruin he breathed with an ardent and inextinguiſhable zeal. He therefore diſcourſed concerning the two natures in CHRIST after the Syrian manner;

---

draw their force only from the different opinions, which the ingenious Mr. TOLL and his learned antagoniſt entertain concerning the importance of the doctrine, in favour of which this pretended miracle is ſaid to have been wrought. The grand queſtion, whoſe deciſion alone can finiſh this controverſy, is, whether the tongues of theſe African confeſſors were entirely rooted out, or no? The caſe of the two who *remained dumb* furniſhes a ſhrewd preſumption, that the cruel operation was not equally performed upon all. The immorality of theſe two, and the judgment of God, ſuſpending with reſpect to them the influence of the miracle, do not ſolve this difficulty entirely, ſince (as we obſerved above) many have been poſſeſſed of *ſupernatural gifts* without *graces*; and CHRIST tells us, that many have *caſt out devils in his name*, whom at the laſt day he will not acknowledge as his faithful ſervants.

[i] See RUINARTI *Hiſtor. Perſequut. Vandal.* part. II. cap. vii. p. 482. See *Bibliotheque Britannique*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 339. tom. v. part. I. p. 171.

and commanded his diſciples to diſtinguiſh carefully between the *actions* and *perceptions* [k] of the ſon of God, and thoſe of the ſon of man [l].

The occaſion of the Neſtorian controverſy.

VI. The occaſion of this diſagreeable controverſy was furniſhed by the preſbyter ANASTASIUS, a friend of NESTORIUS. This preſbyter, in a public diſcourſe, pronounced A. D. 428, declaimed warmly againſt the title of Θεοτόκος, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently attributed to the Virgin MARY in the controverſy againſt the Arians, than it had formerly been, and was a favourite term with the followers of APOLLINARIS. He, at the ſame time, gave it as his opinion, that the Holy Virgin was rather to be called Χριστοτόκος, i. e. *mother of Chriſt*, ſince the deity can neither be born nor die, and of conſequence the ſon of man alone could derive his birth from an earthly parent. NESTORIUS applauded theſe ſentiments, and explained and defended them in ſeveral diſcourſes [m]. But both he and his friend ANASTASIUS were keenly oppoſed by certain monks at *Conſtantinople*, who maintained that the ſon of MARY was *God incarnate*, and excited the zeal and fury of the populace to maintain this doctrine againſt NESTORIUS. Notwithſtanding all this, the diſcourſes of the latter were extremely well received in many places, and had the majority on their ſide. The Egyptian monks had no ſooner peruſed them, than they were perſuaded, by the weight of the arguments they contained, to embrace the opinions of NESTORIUS, and accordingly ceaſed to call the Bleſſed Virgin the *mother of God*.

Neſtorius and Cyril reciprocally anathematized by each other.

VII. The Prelate, who ruled the ſea of *Alexandria* at this time, was CYRIL, a man of a haughty, turbulent, and imperious temper, and painfully jealous of the riſing power and authority of the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. As ſoon as this controverſy came to his knowledge, he cenſured the Egyptian monks and NESTORIUS; and finding the latter little diſpoſed to ſubmit to his cenſure, he proceeded to violent meaſures, took counſel with CELESTINE, biſhop of *Rome*, whom he had engaged on his ſide, aſſembled a council at *Alexandria*, A. D. 430, and hurled no leſs than twelve Anathemas at the head of NESTORIUS. The thunderſtruck prelate did not ſink under this violent ſhock; but ſeeing himſelf unjuſtly accuſed of derogating from the majeſty of CHRIST, he retorted the ſame accuſation upon his adverſary, charged him with the Apollinarian hereſy, with confounding the two natures in CHRIST, and loaded CYRIL with as many Anathemas as he had received from him. This unhappy conteſt between two biſhops of the firſt order proceeded rather from corrupt motives of jealouſy and ambition, than from a ſincere and

---

[(k) The original word *perpeſſio*, which ſignifies properly *ſuffering*, or *paſſion*, we have here tranſlated, by the general term, *perception*, becauſe *ſuffering*, or *paſſion*, cannot be, in any ſenſe, attributed to the *divine nature*.]

[l] The jeſuit DOUCIN publiſhed at *Paris*, A. D. 1716, *A hiſtory of Neſtorianiſm*; but it is ſuch a hiſtory as might be expected from a writer, who was obliged, by his profeſſion, to place the arrogant CYRIL among the ſaints, and NESTORIUS among the heretics. The ancient writers, on both ſides of this controverſy, are mentioned by JO. FRANC. BUDDÆUS, in his *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1084. The accounts given of this diſpute by the Oriental writers, are collected by EUSEB. RENAUDOT. in his *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 108. and by JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 67.

[m] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. i. p. 2199. See alſo JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 199.

diſintereſted zeal for the truth, and was the ſource of evils and calamities without number.

The council of *Epheſus.*

VIII. When the ſpirits were ſo exaſperated on both ſides, by reciprocal excommunications and polemic writings, that there was no proſpect of an amicable iſſue to this unintelligible controverſy, THEODOSIUS the younger called a council at *Epheſus*, A. D. 431, which was the *third general council* in the annals of the church. In this council CYRIL preſided, though he was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of NESTORIUS; and he propoſed examining and determining the matter in debate before JOHN of *Antioch*, and the other eaſtern biſhops arrived. NESTORIUS objected againſt this proceeding, as irregular and unjuſt; but his remonſtrances being without effect, he refuſed to comply with the ſummons which called him to appear before the council. CYRIL, on the other hand, puſhing on matters with a lawleſs violence, NESTORIUS was judged without being heard; and, during the abſence of a great number of thoſe biſhops who belonged to the council, he was compared with the traitor JUDAS, charged with blaſphemy againſt the divine majeſty, deprived of his epiſcopal dignity, and ſent into exile where he finiſhed his days [n]. The tranſactions of this council will appear to the candid and equitable reader in the moſt unfavourable light, as full of low artifice, contrary to all the rules of juſtice, and even deſtitute of the leaſt air of common decency. The doctrine, however, that was eſtabliſhed in it concerning CHRIST, was that which has been always acknowledged and adopted by the majority of Chriſtians, *viz.* "That CHRIST was *one divine perſon*, in "whom *two natures* were moſt cloſely and intimately united, but without "being mixed or confounded together."

The judgment which the impartial will form concerning this controverſy.

IX. NESTORIUS, among other accuſations of leſs moment, was charged with dividing the nature of CHRIST into *two diſtinct perſons*; and with having maintained, that the *divine nature* was ſuperadded to the *human nature* of JESUS, after it was formed, and was no more than an auxiliary ſupport to the *man* CHRIST, through the whole of his life. NESTORIUS denied this charge even to the laſt, and ſolemlny profeſſed his entire diſapprobation of this doctrine [o]. Nor indeed was this opinion ever propoſed by him in any of his writings, but was only charged upon him by his iniquitous adverſaries, as a conſequence drawn from ſome incautious and ambiguous terms he uſed, and particularly from his refuſing to call the Virgin MARY, the *mother of God* [p]. Hence many, nay, the greateſt part of writers both ancient and modern, after a thorough examination of this matter, have poſitively concluded that the opinions of NESTORIUS, and the council which condemned them, were the ſame in effect; that their difference was in words only, and that the whole blame of this unhappy controverſy was to be charged upon the turbulent ſpirit of CYRIL, and his averſion to NESTORIUS [q].

---

[n] Thoſe that deſire a more ample account of this council, may conſult the *Variorum Patrum Epiſtolæ ad Concilium Epheſinum pertinentes*, publiſhed at *Louvain* in the year 1682, from ſome Vatican and other manuſcripts, by CHRISTIAN LUPUS. NESTORIUS, in conſequence of the ſentence pronounced againſt him in this council, was firſt baniſhed to *Petra* in *Arabia*, and afterwards to *Oaſis*, a ſolitary place in the deſerts of *Egypt*, where he died in the year 435. The accounts given of his tragical death by EVAGRIUS, in his *Eccl. Hiſt.* lib. i. cap. vii. and by THEODORUS the Reader, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. ii. p. 565. are entirely fabulous. [Dr. MOSHEIM's account of the time of NESTORIUS's death is perhaps unexact; for it appears, that NESTORIUS was at *Oaſis*, when SOCRATES wrote, that is, A. D. 439. See *Socrat.* lib. vii. cap. 34.]

[o] See GARNIER's edition of the works of MARIUS MERCATOR, tom. ii. p. 286. See alſo the fragments of thoſe letters which NESTORIUS wrote ſometime before his death, which are to be found in JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 40, 41.

[p] It is remarkable, that CYRIL would not hear the explanations which NESTORIUS of-

This judgment may be juſt upon the whole; but it is however true, that NESTORIUS committed two faults in the courſe of this controverſy. The firſt was his giving offence to many Chriſtians by abrogating a trite and innocent term [r]; and the ſecond, his preſumptuouſly attempting to explain, by uncouth compariſons and improper expreſſions, a myſtery which infinitely ſurpaſſes the extent of our imperfect reaſon. If to theſe defects we add the deſpotic ſpirit, and the exceſſive warmth of this perſecuted prelate, it will be difficult to decide who is moſt to be blamed, as the principal fomenter of this violent conteſt, CYRIL or NESTORIUS [s].

The progreſs of Neſtorianiſm after the council of *Epheſus.*

X. The council of *Epheſus*, inſtead of healing theſe diviſions, did but inflame them more and more, and almoſt deſtroyed all hope of reſtoring concord and tranquillity in the church. JOHN of *Antioch*, and the other eaſtern biſhops, for whoſe arrival CYRIL had refuſed to wait, met at *Epheſus*, and pronounced againſt him and MEMNON, the biſhop of that city, who was his creature, as ſevere a ſentence, as they had thundered againſt NESTORIUS. Hence aroſe a new and obſtinate diſſenſion between CYRIL and the Orientals, with JOHN the biſhop of *Antioch* at their head. This flame was, indeed, ſomewhat abated, A. D. 433, after CYRIL had received the *articles of faith* drawn up by JOHN; and abandoned certain phraſes and expreſſions, of which the litigious might make a pernicious uſe. But the commotions, which aroſe

---

fered to give of his doctrine. Nay, the latter offered to grant the title of *Mother of God* to the Virgin MARY, provided that nothing elſe was thereby meant, but that *the man born of her was united to the divinity.* See *Socrat.* lib. vii. cap. 34.]

[q] LUTHER was the firſt of the modern writers who thought thus. And he inveighed againſt CYRIL, with the greateſt bitterneſs, in his book *De conciliis*, tom. vii. Opp. Altenb. p. 265, 266. 273. See alſo BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the articles NESTORIUS and RODON. CHRIST. AUGUST. SALIG, *De Eutychianiſmo ante Eutychen*, p. 200. OTTO FRID. SCHUTZIUS, *De vita Chytræi*, lib. ii. cap. xxix. p. 190, 191. JO. VOIGT. *Biblioth. Hiſtoriæ Hæreſiologicæ*, tom i. part. III. p. 457. PAUL. ERNEST. JABLONSKY, *Exerc. de Neſtorianiſmo*, publiſhed at *Berlin*, A. D. 1720. THESAUR. *Epiſtolic. Crozianus*, tom. i. p. 184. tom. iii. p. 175. *La Vie de la Croze, par* JORDAN, p. 231. and many others. As to the faults that have been laid to the charge of NESTORIUS, they are collected by ASSEMAN, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 210.

[(r) The title of *Mother of God*, applied to the Virgin MARY, is not perhaps ſo *innocent* as Dr. MOSHEIM takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can preſent no idea at all, and to the ignorant and unwary it may preſent the moſt abſurd and monſtrous notions. The invention and uſe of ſuch myſterious terms, as have no place in ſcripture, is, undoubtedly, pernicious to true religion.]

[(s) There is no difficulty at all in deciding this queſtion. NESTORIUS, though poſſeſſed of an arrogant and perſecuting ſpirit in general, yet does not ſeem to deſerve, in this particular caſe, the reproaches that are due to CYRIL. ANASTASIUS, and not NESTORIUS, was the firſt who kindled the flame; and NESTORIUS was the ſuffering and perſecuted party from the beginning of the controverſy to his death. His offers of accommodation were refuſed; his explanations were not red; his ſubmiſſion was rejected, and he was condemned unheard.]

from this fatal controverſy, were more durable in the eaſt [t]. Nothing could oppoſe the progreſs of Neſtorianiſm in thoſe parts. The diſcipline and friends of the perſecuted prelate carried his doctrine through all the Oriental provinces, and erected every where congregations which profeſſed an invincible oppoſition to the decrees of the council of *Epheſus*. The Perſians, among others, oppoſed Cyril in the moſt vigorous manner, maintained that Nestorius had been unjuſtly condemned at *Epheſus*, and charged Cyril with removing that diſtinction which ſubſiſts between the *two natures* in Christ. But nothing tended ſo much to propagate with rapidity the doctrine of Nestorius, as its being received in the famous ſchool which had for a long time flouriſhed at *Edeſſa*. For the doctors of this renowned academy not only inſtructed the youth in the Neſtorian tenets, but tranſlated from the Greek into the Syriac language the books of Nestorius, of his maſter Theodorus of *Mopſueſtia*; and the writings alſo of Diodorus of *Tarſus*, and ſpred them abroad throughout *Aſſyria* and *Perſia* [u].

Barſumas, a zealous promoter of Neſtorianiſm.

XI. Of all the promoters of the Neſtorian cauſe, there was none to whom it has ſuch weighty obligations as to the famous Barsumas, who was ejected out of his place in the ſchool of *Edeſſa*, and created biſhop of *Niſibis*, A. D. 435. This zealous prelate laboured with incredible aſſiduity and dexterity, from the year 440 to 485, to procure, for the Neſtorians, a ſolid and permanent ſettlement in *Perſia*; and he was vigorouſly ſeconded in this undertaking by Maanes biſhop of *Ardaſcira*. And ſo remarkable was the ſucceſs which crowned the labours of Barsumas, that his fame extended throughout the eaſt; and the Neſtorians, which ſtill remain in *Chaldæa*, *Perſia*, *Aſſyria*, and the adjacent countries, conſider him alone, and not without reaſon, as their parent and founder. This indefatigable eccleſiaſtic not only perſuaded Pherozes, the *Perſian* monarch, to expel out of his dominions ſuch Chriſtians as had adopted the opinions of the Greeks, and to admit the Neſtorians in their place, but he even engaged him to put the latter in poſſeſſion of the principal ſeat of eccleſiaſtical authority in *Perſia*, the ſee of *Seleucia*, which the Patriarch or Catholic of the Neſtorians has always filled even down to our time [w]. The zeal and activity of Barsumas did not end here: he erected a famous ſchool at *Niſibis*, from whence iſſued thoſe Neſtorian doctors, who, in this and the following century, ſpred abroad their tenets through *Egypt*, *Syria*, *Arabia*, *India*, *Tartary*, and *China* [x].

---

[t] See Christ. Aug. Salig, *De Eutychianiſmo ante Eutychen*, p. 243.

[u] See Jos. Simon Assemanni *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 351. tom. iii. part. II. p. 69. This learned author may be advantageouſly uſed to correct what Eusebius Renaud. has ſaid (in the ſecond tome of his *Liturgiæ Orientales*, p. 99.) concerning the firſt riſe of the Neſtorian doctrine in the eaſtern provinces. See alſo the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* Theodorus *the Reader*, book ii. p. 558.

[(w) The biſhop of *Seleucia*, was, by the twenty-third canon of the council of *Nice*, honoured with peculiar marks of diſtinction, and among others with the title of Catholic. He was inveſted with the power of ordaining archbiſhops (a privilege which belonged to the patriarchs alone) exalted above all the Grecian biſhops, honoured as a patriarch, and in the œcumenical councils was the ſixth in rank after the biſhop of *Jeruſalem*. See *Acta Concilii Nicæni Arab.* Alphons. Pisan, lib. iii. can. xxiii. xxxiv.]

[x] See, for an ample account of this matter, Jos. Sim. Assemanni *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 77.

The diviſions of the Neſtorians ceaſe.

XII. The Neſtorians, before their affairs were thus happily ſettled, had been divided among themſelves with reſpect to the method of explaining their doctrine. Some maintained, that the *manner* in which the two natures were united in CHRIST, was abſolutely unknown: others, that the union of the divine nature with the man JESUS was only an union of *will*, *operation*, and *dignity* [y]. This diſſenſion, however, entirely ceaſed when the Neſtorians were gathered together into one religious community, and lived in tranquillity under their own eccleſiaſtical government and laws. Their doctrine, as it was then determined in ſeveral councils aſſembled at *Seleucia*, amounts to what follows: "That in the Saviour of the world there were *two perſons*, or "ὑποστάσεις; of which the one was *divine*, even the eternal WORD; and "the other, which was *human*, was the man JESUS; that theſe two perſons "had only one *aſpect* [z]; that the union between the ſon of God and the "ſon of man was formed in the moment of the Virgin's conception, and was "never to be diſſolved; that it was not, however, an union of nature or of "perſon, but only of will and affection; that CHRIST was, therefore, to be "carefully diſtinguiſhed from GOD, who dwelt in him as in his temple; and "that MARY was to be called the *mother of* CHRIST, and not the *mother of* "*God*."

The abettors of this doctrine hold NESTORIUS in the higheſt veneration, as a man of ſingular and eminent ſanctity, and worthy to be had in perputual remembrance: but they maintain, at the ſame time, that the doctrine he taught was much older than himſelf, and had been handed down from the earlieſt times of the Chriſtian church; and for this reaſon they abſolutely refuſed the title of Neſtorians. And, indeed, if we examine the matter attentively, we ſhall find that BARSUMAS and his followers, inſtead of teaching their diſciples preciſely the doctrine of NESTORIUS, rather poliſhed and improved his uncouth ſyſtem to their own taſte, and added to it ſeveral tenets of which the good man never dreamt.

The Eutychian ſect.

XIII. A violent averſion to the Neſtorian errors led many into the oppoſite extreme. This was the caſe with the famous EUTYCHES, abbot of a certain convent of monks at *Conſtantinople*, and founder of a ſect, which was in direct oppoſition to that of NESTORIUS, yet equally prejudicial to the intereſts of the Chriſtian church; by the peſtilential diſcords and animoſities it produced. The opinions of this new faction ſhot like lightning through the eaſt; and it acquired ſuch ſtrength in its progreſs, as to create much uneaſineſs both to the Greeks and Neſtorians, whoſe moſt vigorous efforts were not ſufficient to prevent its riſing to a high degree of credit and ſplendor. EUTYCHES began theſe troubles A. D. 448, when he was far advanced in years; and to exert his utmoſt force and vehemence in oppoſing the progreſs of the Neſtorian doctrine, he expreſſed his ſentiments concerning the perſon of CHRIST in the very terms which the Egyptians made uſe of for that purpoſe, and taught, that *in* CHRIST *there was but one nature*, viz. *that of the incarnate word* [a]. Hence he was thought to deny the exiſtence of the human nature in CHRIST, and was accuſed of this, by EUSEBIUS of *Dorylæum*, in the council that was aſſembled by FLAVIANUS at *Conſtantinople*, probably this ſame year. By a decree of this council, he was ordered to renounce the abovementioned opinion, which he obſtinately refuſed to do; and was, on that account, excommunicated and depoſed; little diſpoſed, however, to acquieſce in this ſentence, he appealed to the deciſion of a general council.

---

[y] LEONTIUS BYZANT. *Adverſus Neſtorian. et Eutychian.* p. 537. tom. i. *Lection. Antiquar.* HENR. CANISII. JAC. BASNAG. *Prolegomen. ad Caniſium*, tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19.

[(z) This is the only way I know of tranſlating the word *barſopa*, which was the term uſed by NESTORIUS, and which the Greeks render by the term πρόσωπος. The word *perſon* would have done better in this unintelligible phraſe, had it not been uſed immediately before in a different ſenſe from that which NESTORIUS would convey by the obſcure term *aſpect*.]

The council, which was called *Conventus Latronum.*

XIV. In conſequence of this appeal, the emperor THEODOSIUS aſſembled an *œcumenical council* at *Epheſus*, A. D. 449, at the head of which he placed DIOSCORUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, the ſucceſſor of CYRIL, the faithful imitator of his arrogance and fury, and a declared enemy to the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. Accordingly, by the influence and caballing of this turbulent man, matters were carried on in this council with the ſame want of equity and decency that had diſhonoured a former Epheſian council, and caracteriſed the proceedings of CYRIL againſt NESTORIUS. For DIOSCORUS, in whoſe church a doctrine almoſt the ſame with that of the Eutychians, was conſtantly taught, confounded matters with ſuch artifice and dexterity, that the doctrine of *one incarnate nature* triumphed, and EUTYCHES was acquitted of the charge of error that had been brought againſt him. FLAVIANUS, on the other hand, was, by the order of this unrighteous council, publicly ſcourged in the moſt barbarous manner, and baniſhed to *Epipas*, a city of *Lydia*, where ſoon after he ended his days [b]. The Greeks called this Epheſian council, a band, or *aſſembly of robbers*, σύνοδον ληστρικὴν, to ſignify that every thing was carried in it by fraud or violence [c]. And many councils, indeed, both in this and the following ages are equally intitled to the ſame diſhonourable appellation.

The council of *Chalcedon.*

XV. The face of affairs ſoon changed, and aſſumed an aſpect utterly unfavourable to the party whom the Epheſian council had rendered triumphant. FLAVIANUS and his followers not only engaged LEO the GREAT, biſhop of *Rome*, in their intereſts (for the Roman pontif was the ordinary refuge of the oppreſſed and conquered party in this century) but alſo remonſtrated to the emperor, that a matter of ſuch an arduous and important nature required, in order to its deciſion, a council compoſed out of the church univerſal. LEO ſeconded this latter requeſt, demanded of THEODOSIUS a general council, which no entreaties could perſuade this emperor to grant. Upon his death, however, his ſucceſſor MARCIAN, conſented to LEO's demand, and called, in the year 451, the council of *Chalcedon* [d], which is reckoned the *fourth general*, or *œcumenical council*. The legates of LEO, who, in his famous letter to FLAVIANUS, had already condemned the Eutychian doctrine, preſided in this grand and crowded aſſembly. DIOSCORUS was condemned, depoſed, and baniſhed into *Paphlagonia*, the acts of the council of *Epheſus* were annulled, the *epiſtle of* LEO received as a rule of faith [e]; EUTYCHES, who had been already ſent into baniſhment, and deprived of his Sacerdotal dignity by the emperor, was now condemned, though abſent; and the following doctrine, which is at this time almoſt generally received, was inculcated upon Chriſtians as the object of faith, *viz.* "That in CHRIST *two diſtinct natures* were united " in *one perſon*, and that without any change, mixture, or confuſion."

---

[a] That CYRIL expreſſed himſelf in this manner, and appealed, for his juſtification in ſo doing, to the authority of ATHANASIUS, is evident beyond all poſſibility of contradiction. But it is uncertain whether or no this manner of expreſſion was adopted by ATHANASIUS, ſince many are of opinion, that the book, in which it is found, has been falſely attributed to him. See MICH. LE QUIEN, *Diſſert.* ii. *in Damaſcenum*, p. 31. CHRIST. AUG. SALIG, *De Eutychianiſmo ante Eutychen*, p. 112. It appears, by what we read in the *Biblioth. Oriental.* &c. of ASSEMAN, tom. i. p. 219. that the Syrians expreſſed themſelves in this manner before EUTYCHES, though without deſigning thereby to broach any new doctrine, but rather without well knowing what they ſaid. We ſtand yet in need of a ſolid and accurate hiſtory of the Eutychian troubles; notwithſtanding the labours of the learned SALIG upon that ſubject.

[b] See the *Concilia* JO. HARDUINI, tom. i. p. 82. LIBERATI *Breviarium*, cap. xii. p. 76. LEONIS M. *Epiſt.* xciii. p. 625. NICEPHORI *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtic.* lib. xiv. cap. lxvii. p. 550, &c.

[(c) Though FLAVIANUS died ſoon after the council of *Epheſus*, of the bruiſes he had received from DIOSCORUS, and the other biſhops of his party in that horrid aſſembly, yet, before his death, he had appealed to LEO; and this appeal purſued by LEO, occaſioned the council, in which EUTYCHES was condemned, and the bloody DIOSCORUS depoſed.]

Warm conteſts ſucceed the council of *Chalcedon.*

XVI. The remedy applied by this council to heal the wounds of a torn and divided church, proved really worſe than the diſeaſe. For a great number of Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though of various characters and different opinions in other reſpects, united in oppoſing, with the utmoſt vehemence, the council of *Chalcedon* and the *epiſtle of* LEO; which it had adopted as a rule of faith, and were unanimous in maintaining an *unity* of *nature*, as well as of *perſon*, in JESUS CHRIST. Hence aroſe deplorable diſcords and civil wars, whoſe fury and barbarity were carried to the moſt exceſſive and incredible lengths. Upon the death of the emperor MARCIAN, the populace aſſembled tumultuouſly in *Egypt*, maſſacred PROTERIUS, the ſucceſſor of DIOSCORUS, and ſubſtituted in his place TIMOTHEUS ÆLURUS, who was a zealous defender of the Eutychian doctrine of *one incarnate nature* in CHRIST. This latter, indeed, was depoſed and baniſhed by the emperor LEO; but, upon his death, was reſtored by BASILISCUS both to his liberty and epiſcopal dignity. After the death of ÆLURUS, the defenders of the council of *Chalcedon*, choſe in his place TIMOTHEUS, ſurnamed SALOPHACIOLUS, while the partiſans of the Eutychian doctrine of the *one nature*, elected ſchiſmatically PETER MOGGUS to the ſame dignity. An edict of the emperor ZENO obliged the latter to yield. The triumph, however, of the Chalcedonians, on this occaſion, was but tranſitory; for, upon the death of TIMOTHEUS, JOHN TALAIA, whom

---

[(*d*) This council was, by the emperor's ſummons, firſt aſſembled at *Nice*, but afterwards removed to *Chalcedon*; that the emperor, who, on account of the irruption of the Hunns into *Illyricum*, was unwilling to go far from *Conſtantinople*, might aſſiſt at it in perſon.]

[(*e*) This was the letter which LEO had written to FLAVIANUS, after having been informed by him of what had paſſed in the council of *Conſtantinople*. In this epiſtle, LEO approves of the deciſions of that council, declares the doctrine of EUTYCHES heretical and impious, explains, with great appearance of perſpicuity, the doctrine of the Catholic church upon this perplexed ſubject; ſo that this letter was eſteemed a maſterpiece both of logic and eloquence, and was conſtantly red, during the *Advent*, in the weſtern churches.]

they had choſen in his place, was removed by the ſame emperor [*f*]; and Moggus, or Mongus, by an imperial edict, and the favour of Acacius, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, was, in the year 482, raiſed to the ſee of *Alexandria*.

Conteſts in Syria and Armenia.

XVII. The abbot Barsumas (whom the reader muſt be careful not to confound with Barsumas of *Niſibis*, the famous promoter of the Neſtorian doctrines) having been condemned by the council of *Chalcedon* [*g*], brought the Eutychian opinions into *Syria*, and, by the miniſtry of his diſciple Samuel, ſpred them amongſt the Armenians about the year 460. This doctrine, however, as it was commonly explained, had ſomething ſo harſh and ſhocking in it, that the Syrians were eaſily engaged to abandon it by the exhortations of Xenaias, otherwiſe called Philoxenus, biſhop of *Hierapolis*, and the famous Peter Fullo. Theſe doctors rejected the opinion, attributed to Eutyches, that *the human nature of* Christ *was abſorbed by the divine* [*h*], and modified matters ſo as to form the following hypotheſis: “That in the ſon of God there was *one nature*, which, notwithſtanding its *unity*, was *double* and *compounded*.” This notion was not leſs repugnant to the deciſions of the council of *Chalcedon* than the Eutychian doctrine, and was therefore ſtedfaſtly oppoſed by thoſe who acknowledged the authority of that council [*i*].

The troubles excited by Peter the fuller.

XVIII. Peter, ſurnamed Fullo, from the trade of fuller, which he exerciſed in his monaſtic ſtate, had uſurped the ſee of *Antioch*, and, after having been ſeveral times depoſed and condemned on account of the bitterneſs of his oppoſition to the council of *Chalcedon*, was fixed in it, at laſt, A. D. 482, by the authority of the emperor Zeno, and the favour of Acacius biſhop of *Conſtantinople* [*k*]. This troubleſome and contentious man excited new diſcords in the church, and ſeemed ambitious of forming a new ſect under the name of Theopaſchites [*l*]; for to the words, *O God moſt holy*, &c. in the famous hymn which the Greeks called *Triſagium*; he ordered the following phraſe to be added in the eaſtern churches, *who haſt ſuffered for us upon the croſs*. His deſign in this was manifeſtly to raiſe a new ſect, and alſo to fix more deeply, in the minds of the people, the doctrine of *one nature in* Christ, to which he was zealouſly attached. His adverſaries, however, and eſpecially Felix the Roman pontif, interpreted this addition to the hymn abovementioned in a quite different manner, and charged him with maintaining, that all the three perſons of the Godhead were crucified: and hence thoſe who approved of his addition were called Theopaſchites. The conſequence of this diſpute was, that the weſtern Chriſtians rejected the addition inſerted by FULLO, which they judged relative to the whole trinity; while the Orientals uſed it conſtantly after this period, and that without giving the leaſt offence, becauſe they applied it to CHRIST alone [m].

[*f*] See Liberati *Breviarium*, cap. xvi, xvii, xviii. Evagr. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. ii. cap. viii. lib. iii. cap. iii. Lequien, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. ii. p. 410.

[(*g*) The Barsumas, here mentioned, was he who aſſiſted the biſhop of *Alexandria* (Dioscorus) and the ſoldiers, in beating Flavianus to death in the council of *Epheſus*, and, to ſhun whoſe fury, the Orthodox biſhops were forced to creep into holes, and hide themſelves under benches in that *pious aſſembly*.]

[(*h*) Eutyches never affirmed what is here attributed to him; he maintained ſimply, that the *two natures*, which exiſted in Christ before his incarnation, became *one* after it by the *hypoſtatical union*. This miſerable diſpute about words was nouriſhed by the contending parties, having no clear ideas of the terms *perſon* and *nature*; as alſo by an invincible ignorance of the ſubject in diſpute.]

[*i*] Jos. Sim. Assemanni *Biblioth. Orient. Vat.* tom. ii. p. 1—10. See alſo the *Diſſertation* of this author, *De Monophyſitis*, which is prefixed to this volume.

[*k*] Valesii *Diſſertatio de* Pet. Fullone, *et de Synodis adverſus eum collectis*, which is added to the third volume of the *Scriptor. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 173.

[(*l*) This word expreſſes the enormous error of thoſe frantic doctors, who imagined that the Godhead ſuffered in and with Christ.]

The *Henotican* of Zeno.

XIX. To put an end to this controverſy, which had produced the moſt unhappy diviſions both in church and ſtate, the emperor ZENO, by the advice of ACACIUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, publiſhed, A. D. 482, the famous *Henoticon*, or *Decree of union*, which was deſigned to reconcile the contending parties. This *decree* repeated and confirmed all that had been enacted in the councils of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon*, againſt the Arians, Neſtorians, and Eutychians, without making any particular mention of the council of *Chalcedon* [n]. For ACACIUS had perſuaded the emperor, that the preſent oppoſition was not carried on againſt the decrees that had paſſed in the council of *Chalcedon*, but againſt the council itſelf; with reſpect to which, therefore, an entire ſilence was, undoubtedly, prudent in a propoſal, which, inſtead of reviving, was deſigned to put an end to all diſputes, and to reconcile the moſt jarring principles.

In the mean time, MONGUS and FULLO, who filled the ſees of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and headed the ſect of the Monophyſites [o], ſubſcribed this *Decree of union*, which was alſo approved by ACACIUS of *Conſtantinople*, and by all thoſe of the two contending parties who were at all remarkable for their candour and moderation. But there were on all ſides violent and obſtinate bigots, who oppoſed, with vigour, theſe pacific meaſures, and complained of the Henoticon as injurious to the honour and authority of the moſt holy council of *Chalcedon* [p]. Hence aroſe new conteſts and new diviſions not leſs deplorable than thoſe which the *Decree of union* was deſigned to ſuppreſs.

Produces new conteſts among the Eutychians.

XX. A conſiderable body of the Monophyſites, or Eutychians, looked upon the conduct of MONGUS, who had ſubſcribed the *decree* as highly criminal, and conſequently formed themſelves into a new faction, under the title of ACEPHALI, i. e. *headleſs*, becauſe, by the ſubmiſſion of MONGUS, they had been deprived of their chief [q]. This ſect was afterwards divided into three others, who were called Anthropomorphites Barſanuphites, and Eſaianiſts; and theſe again, in the following century, were the unhappy occaſion of new factions of which the ancient writers make frequent mention [*r*]. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve here, for the information of thoſe, whoſe curioſity intereſts them in inquiries of this nature, that theſe ſubdiviſions of the Eutychian ſect are not to be adopted with too much facility. Some of them are entirely fictitious; others are characteriſed by a nominal, and not by a real difference; the diviſion is in *words*, and not in *things*; while a third ſort are diſtinguiſhed, not by their peculiar doctrines, but by certain rites and inſtitutions, and matters of a merely circumſtantial nature. Be that as it will, theſe numerous branches of the Eutychian faction did not flouriſh long; they declined gradually in the following century; and the influence and authority of the famous BARADÆUS contributed principally to their total extinction by the union he eſtabliſhed among the numbers of that ſect.

---

[m] See NORIS. *Lib. de uno ex Trinitate carne paſſo*, tom. iii. Opp. *Diſſ.* i. cap. iii. p. 782. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 518. tom. ii. p. 36. 180.

[n] EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. xiv. LIBERATI *Breviarium Hiſt.* cap. xviii.

[(o) This word expreſſes the doctrine of thoſe who believed that in CHRIST there was but *one nature*, and is, in moſt reſpects, the ſame with the term *Eutychians.*]

[p] See FACUNDUS HERMIAN. *Defenſ. trium Capitulor.* lib. xii. cap. iv.

[q] EVAGR. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iii. cap. xiii. LEONTIUS BYZANT. *De ſectis*, tom. i. *Lection. Antiq.* CANISII, p. 537. TIMOTH. *in* COTELERII *Monument. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409.

And alſo among the partiſans of the council of *Chalcedon.*

XXI. The Roman pontif, FELIX II, having aſſembled an Italian council, compoſed of ſixty-ſeven biſhops, condemned, depoſed, and cut off, from the communion of the church, ACACIUS biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, as a perfidious enemy to the truth. Several articles were alleged againſt ACACIUS, to furniſh a pretext for the ſeverity of this ſentence; ſuch as his attachment to the Monophyſites, and their leaders MONGUS and FULLO, the contempt with which he treated the council of *Chalcedon*, and other accuſations of a like nature. But the true reaſons of theſe proceedings, and of the irreconcileable hatred which the Roman pontifs indulged againſt ACACIUS, were his denying the ſupremacy of the biſhop of *Rome*, his oppoſing it throughout the whole courſe of his miniſtry [*s*], and his ambitious efforts to enlarge beyond all bounds the authority and prerogatives of the ſee of *Conſtantinople.* The Greeks, however, defended the character and memory of their biſhop againſt all the aſperſions which were caſt upon him by the Romans. Hence aroſe a new ſchiſm, and new conteſts, which were carried on with great violence until the following century, when the obſtinacy and perſeverance of the Latins triumphed over the oppoſition of the oriental Chriſtians, and brought about an agreement; in conſequence of which, the names of ACACIUS and FULLO were ſtruck out of the *diptychs*, or ſacred regiſters, and thus branded with perpetual infamy [*t*].

---

[r] Theſe ſects are enumerated by BASNAGE, in his *Prolegom. ad* HEN. CANISII *Lection. Antiqu.* cap. iii. and by ASSEMAN, in his *Diſſertatio de Monophyſitis*, p. 7.

[(s) This again is one of the periods of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, in which we find a multitude of events, which are ſo many proofs how far the ſupremacy of the biſhop of *Rome* was from being univerſally acknowledged. Pope FELIX II, depoſes and excommunicates ACACIUS the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who not only receives this ſentence with contempt, but, in his turn, anathematizes and excommunicates the pope, and orders his name to be ſtruck out of the *diptychs.* This conduct of ACACIUS is approved by the emperor, the church of *Conſtantinople*, by almoſt all the eaſtern biſhops, nay, by even ANDREAS of *Theſſalonica*, who was at that time the pope's vicar for *Eaſt Illyricum*. This was the occaſion of that general ſchiſm, which continued for the ſpace of twenty-five years, between the eaſtern and weſtern churches. It is here worthy of obſervation, that the eaſtern biſhops did not adhere to the cauſe of ACACIUS from any other principle, as appears from the moſt authentic records of thoſe times, than a perſuaſion of the illegality of his excommunication by the Roman pontif, who, in their judgment, had not a right to depoſe the firſt biſhop of the eaſt, without the conſent of a general council.]

[t] HEN. VALESIUS, *Diſſert. de ſynodis Roman. in quibus damnatus eſt Acacius, ad calcem,*

The doctrines of Eutyches and the Monophyſites.

XXII. Theſe deplorable diſſenſions and conteſts had, for their object, a matter of the ſmalleſt importance. EUTYCHES was generally ſuppoſed to have maintained, "That the *divine nature* of CHRIST had abſorbed the "*human*, and that, conſequently, in him there was but *one nature*, viz. the "*divine*;" but the truth of this ſuppoſition is as yet deſtitute of ſufficient evidence. Be that as it will, this opinion, as alſo EUTYCHES its pretended author, were rejected and condemned by thoſe who oppoſed the council of *Chalcedon*, and principally indeed by XENAIAS and FULLO, who are, therefore, improperly called Eutychians, and belong rather to the claſs of the Monophyſites. They, who aſſumed this latter title, held, "That the *divine* "and *human nature* of CHRIST were ſo united, as to form only *one nature*, "yet, without any *change*, *confuſion*, or *mixture* of the two natures:" and that this caution might be carefully obſerved, and their meaning be well underſtood, they frequently expreſſed themſelves thus: "In CHRIST there is one "nature; but that nature is two-fold and compounded[u]." They diſowned all relation and attachment to EUTYCHES; but regarded, with the higheſt veneration, DIOSCORUS, BARSUMAS, XENAIAS, and FULLO, as the pillars of their ſect; and rejected not only the *Epiſtle of* LEO, but alſo the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*. The opinion of the Monophyſites, if we judge of it by the terms in which it is here delivered, does not ſeem to differ in reality, but only in the manner of expreſſion, from that which was eſtabliſhed by the council of *Chalcedon* [w]. But, if we attend carefully to the metaphyſical arguments and ſubtilties which the former employ to confirm their doctrine [x], we ſhall, perhaps, be induced to think that the controverſy between the Monophyſites and Chalcedonians is not merely a diſpute about words.

The Pelagian controverſy.

XXIII. A new controverſy aroſe in the church during this century, and its peſtilential effects extended themſelves through the following ages. The authors of it were PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS, both monks; the former a *Briton*; and the latter a native of *Ireland* [y]: they lived at *Rome* in the

---

tom. iii. *Scriptor. Eccl.* p. 179. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 301. 380, 381. BAYLE'S *Dictionary* in Engliſh, at the article ACACIUS. DAVID BLONDEL, *De la Primauté dans l'Egliſe*, p. 279. *Acta ſanctorum*, tom. iii. Februar. p. 502.

[u] See the paſſages drawn from the writings of the Monophyſites by the moſt learned and, frequently, impartial ASSEMAN, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. ii. p. 25, 26. 29. 34. 117. 133. 135. 277. 297, &c.

[w] Many learned men treat this controverſy as a mere diſpute about words. GREGORY ABULPHARIUS, himſelf a Monophyſite, and the moſt learned of the ſect, declares this as his opinion. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. p. 291. Add to this the *Biblioth. Italique*, tom. xvii. p. 285. LA CROZE, *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme des Indes*, p. 23. and *Hiſtoire du Chriſtianiſme d'Ethiopie*, p. 14. ASSEMAN, though a Roman by birth and by religon, ſeems, in a good meaſure, to have adopted the ſame way of thinking, as appears by p. 297. of the tome quoted above.

[x] See the ſubtile argumentation of ABULPHARAIUS, in the *Biblioth. Orient.* of ASSEMAN, tom. ii. p. 288.

[(y) Nothing very certain can be advanced with reſpect to the native country of CÆLESTIUS, which ſome ſay was *Scotland*, and others, *Campania* in *Italy*. We know, however, that he was deſcended of an illuſtrious family; and that, after having applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the law for ſome time, he retired from the world, and embraced the monaſtic life. See GENNAD. *De Script. Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xliv.]

greateſt reputation, and were univerſally eſteemed on account of their extraordinary piety and virtue [z]. Theſe monks looked upon the doctrines, which were commonly received, “*Concerning the original corruption of human nature*, and *the neceſſity of divine grace to enlighten the underſtanding, and purify the heart*, as prejudicial to the progreſs of holineſs and virtue, and tending to lull mankind in a preſumptuous and fatal ſecurity. They maintained, that theſe doctrines were as falſe as they were pernicious; that the ſins of our *firſt parents* were *imputed* to *them* alone, and not to their *poſterity*; that we derive no *corruption* from their fall, but are born as pure and unſpotted as Adam came out of the forming hand of his creator; that mankind, therefore, are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving to the higheſt degrees of piety and virtue by the uſe of their natural faculties and powers; that, indeed, *external grace* is neceſſary to excite their endeavours; but that they have no need of the *internal* ſuccours of the divine ſpirit.” Theſe notions, and ſome others intimately connected with them [a], were propagated at *Rome*, though in a private manner, by the two monks already mentioned, who, retiring from that city, A. D. 410, upon the approach of the Goths, went firſt into *Sicily*, and afterwards into *Africa*, where they publiſhed their doctrine with more freedom. From *Africa* Pelagius paſſed into *Paleſtine*, while Cælestius remained at *Carthage* with a view to preferment, deſiring to be admitted among the preſbyters of that city. But the diſcovery of his opinions having blaſted his hopes, and his errors being condemned in a council held at *Carthage* A. D. 412, he departed from that city, and went into the eaſt. It was from this time that Augustin, the famous biſhop of *Hippo*, began to attack the tenets of Pelagius and Cælestius in his learned and eloquent writings; and to him, indeed, is principally due the glory of having ſuppreſſed this ſect in its very birth [b].

The progreſs of this controverſy.

XXIV. Things went more ſmoothly with Pelagius in the eaſt, where he enjoyed the protection and favour of John, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, whoſe attachment to the ſentiments of Origen led him naturally to countenance thoſe of Pelagius, on account of the conformity that there ſeemed to be

---

[(z) The learned and furious Jerom, who never once thought of doing common juſtice to thoſe who had the misfortune to differ from him in opinion, accuſed Pelagius of gluttony and intemperance, after he had heard of his errors, though he had admired him before for his exemplary virtue. Augustin, more candid and honeſt, bears impartial teſtimony to the truth; and even while he writes againſt this heretic, acknowledges that he had made great progreſs in virtue and piety, that his life was chaſte, and his manners blameleſs; and this, indeed, is the truth of the matter.]

[(a) The doctrines, that were more immediately connected with the main principles of Pelagius, were, that *infant baptiſm* was not a *ſign* or *ſeal* of the *remiſſion of ſins*, but a *mark* of admiſſion to the *kingdom of heaven*, which was only open to the pure in heart; that *good works* were *meritorious*, and the only conditions of ſalvation, with many others too tedious to mention.]

[b] The Pelagian controverſy has been hiſtorically treated by many learned writers, ſuch as Usher, in his *Antiquit. Eccleſ. Britannicæ*; Laet; Ger. Vossius; Noris; Garnier, in his *Supplement. Oper. Theodoreti*; Jansenius *in Auguſtino*; and others. Longueval alſo, a French jeſuit, wrote *A hiſtory of the Pelagians*. See the Preface to the ninth volume of his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ*, p. 4. After all, it muſt be confeſſed, that of all theſe learned writers none have exhauſted this intereſting ſubject, or treated it with a ſufficient degree of impartiality.

between theſe two ſyſtems. Under the ſhadow of this powerful protection, PELAGIUS made a public profeſſion of his opinions, and formed diſciples in ſeveral places. And though, in the year 415, he was accuſed by OROSIUS, a Spaniſh preſbyter, whom AUGUSTIN had ſent into *Paleſtine* for that purpoſe, before an aſſembly of biſhops met at *Jeruſalem*, yet he was diſmiſſed without the leaſt cenſure; and not only ſo, but was ſoon after fully acquitted of all errors by the council of *Dioſpolis* [*c*].

This controverſy was brought to *Rome*, and referred by CÆLESTIUS and PELAGIUS to the deciſion of ZOSIMUS [*d*], who was raiſed to the pontificate A. D. 417. The new pontif gained over, by the ambiguous and ſeemingly orthodox *confeſſion of faith*, that CÆLESTIUS, who was now at *Rome*, had artfully drawn up, and alſo by the letters and proteſtations of PELAGIUS, pronounced in favour of theſe monks, declared them ſound in the faith, and unjuſtly perſecuted by their adverſaries. The African biſhops, with AUGUSTIN at their head, little affected with this declaration, continued obſtinately to maintain the judgment they had pronounced in this matter, and to ſtrengthen it by their exhortations, their letters, and their writings. ZOSIMUS yielded to the perſeverance of the Africans, changed his mind, and condemned, with the utmoſt ſeverity, PELAGIUS and CÆLESTIUS, whom he had honoured with his approbation, and covered with his protection. This was followed by a train of evils, which purſued theſe two monks without interruption. They were condemned by that ſame Epheſian council which had launched its thunder at the head of NESTORIUS: in ſhort, the Gauls, Britons, and Africans, by their councils, and the emperors, by their edicts and penal laws, demoliſhed this ſect in its infancy, and ſuppreſſed it entirely before it had acquired any tolerable degree of vigour or conſiſtence [*e*].

The Predeſtinarians.

XXV. The unhappy diſputes about the opinions of PELAGIUS occaſioned, as uſually happens, other controverſies equally prejudicial to the peace of the church, and the intereſts of true Chriſtianity. In the courſe of this diſpute, AUGUSTIN had delivered his opinion, *Concerning the neceſſity of divine grace in order to our ſalvation, and the decrees of God with reſpect to the future conditions of men*, without being always conſiſtent with himſelf, or intelligible to others. Hence certain monks of *Adrumetum*, and others, were led into a notion,

---

[*c*] See DANIEL, *Hiſtoire du Concile de Dioſpolis*, which is to be found in the *Opuſcula* of that eloquent and learned jeſuit, publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1724, in three volumes quarto. *Dioſpolis* was a city of *Paleſtine*, known in ſcripture by the name of *Lydda*; and the biſhop, who preſided in this council, was EULOGIUS of *Cæſarea*, Metropolitan of *Paleſtine*.

[(*d*) To preſerve the thread of the hiſtory here, and prevent the reader's being ſurprized to find PELAGIUS and CELESTIUS appealing to *Rome* after having been acquitted at *Dioſpolis*, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that, after the council of *Dioſpolis*, theſe two monks were condemned anew, A. D. 416, by the African biſhops aſſembled at *Carthage*, and thoſe of *Numidia* aſſembled at *Milevum*; upon which they appealed to *Rome*.]

[*e*] See GERARD. JO. VOSSIUS, his *Hiſtoria Pelagiana*, lib. i. cap. lv. p. 130; as alſo the learned obſervations that have been made upon this controverſy, in the *Bibliotheque Italique*, tom. v. p. 74. The writers on both ſides are mentioned by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. 1071. The learned WALL, in his *Hiſtory of Infant Baptiſm*, vol. i. chap. xix. has given a conciſe and elegant account of the Pelagian controverſy; an account which, though imperfect in ſeveral reſpects, abounds with ſolid and uſeful erudition.

"That God not only predeſtinated the wicked to eternal puniſhment, but "alſo to the guilt and tranſgreſſion for which they are puniſhed; and that "thus both the good and bad actions of all men were determined from "eternity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invincible neceſſity." Thoſe, who embraced this opinion, were called Predeſtinarians. AUGUSTIN uſed his utmoſt influence and authority to prevent the ſpreading of this doctrine, and explained his true ſentiments with more perſpicuity, that it might not be attributed to him. His efforts were ſeconded by the councils of *Arles* and *Lions*, in which the doctrine in queſtion was publickly rejected and condemned [*f*]. But we muſt not omit obſerving, that the exiſtence of this Predeſtinarian ſect has been denied by many learned men, and looked upon as an invention of the Semi-pelagians, deſigned to decry the followers of AUGUSTIN, by attributing to them unjuſtly this dangerous and pernicious error [*g*].

Semi-pelagians.

XXVI. A new and different modification was given to the doctrine of AUGUSTIN by the monk CASSIAN, who came from the eaſt into *France*, and erected a monaſtery near *Marſeille*. Nor was he the only one who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of PELAGIUS and the opinions of the African oracle; ſeveral perſons embarked in this undertaking about the year 430, and hence aroſe a new ſect, which were called, by their adverſaries, Semi-pelagians.

The opinions of this ſect have been miſrepreſented, by its enemies, upon ſeveral occaſions; ſuch is generally the fate of all parties in religious controverſies. Their doctrine, as it has been generally explained by the learned, amounted to this: "That *inward preventing grace* was not neceſſary to form "in the ſoul the *firſt beginnings* of true repentance and amendment; that "every one was capable of producing theſe by the mere power of their na-"tural faculties; as alſo of exerciſing faith in CHRIST, and forming the "purpoſes of a holy and ſincere obedience." But they acknowledged at the ſame time, "That none could *perſevere* or *advance* in that holy and virtuous "courſe, which they had the power of *beginning*, without the perpetual ſup-"port, and the powerful aſſiſtance, of the divine grace [*h*]." The diſciples

---

[*f*] See JAC. SIRMONDI *Hiſtoria Prædeſtinatiana*, tom. iv. Opp. p. 271. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. ii. p. 698. DION. PETAVIUS, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. vi. p. 168. 174, &c.

[*g*] See GILB. MAUGUINI *Fabula Prædeſtinatiana confutata*, which he ſubjoined to the ſecond tome of his learned work, intitled, *Collectio variorum Scriptorum qui Sæc.* ix. *de Prædeſtinatione et Gratia ſcripſerunt*. FRED. SPHANHEMIUS, *Introduc. ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſ.* tom. i. Opp. p. 993. JAC. BASNAG. *Adnot. ad Proſperi Chronicon et Præf. ad Fauſtum Regienſem*, tom. i. *Lection. Antiqu.* HENR. CANISII, p. 315. 348. GRANET (who wrote the life of LAUNOY) obſerves, that SIRMOND had ſolicited LAUNOY to write againſt MAUGUIN, who denied the exiſtence of the *Predeſtinarian ſect*; but that the former, having examined the matter with care and application, adopted the ſentiment of MAUGUIN. The whole diſpute about the exiſtence of this ſect, will, when cloſely looked into, appear to be little more perhaps than a diſpute about words. [It may be very true, that about this time, nay, from the time of St. PAUL, certain perſons embraced the Predeſtinarian opinions here mentioned. But there is no ſolid proof, that the abettors of theſe opinions ever formed themſelves into a ſect. See BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 700.]

[(*h*) The leading principles of the Semi-pelagians were the five following: 1. That God did of AUGUSTIN, in *Gaul*, attacked the Semi-pelagians with the utmoſt vehemence, without being able to extirpate or overcome them [*i*]. The doctrine of this ſect was ſo ſuited to the capacities of the generality of men, ſo conformable to the way of thinking that prevailed among the monaſtic orders, ſo well received among the graveſt and moſt learned Grecian doctors, that neither the zeal nor induſtry of its adverſaries could ſtop its rapid and extenſive progreſs. Add to its other advantages, that neither AUGUSTIN nor his followers had ventured to condemn it in all its parts, nor to brand it as an impious and pernicious hereſy.

Various controverſies concerning grace.

XXVII. This was the commencement of thoſe unhappy conteſts, thoſe ſubtile and perplexing diſputes concerning grace, or the nature and operation of that divine power, which is eſſentially required in order to ſalvation, that rent the church into the moſt deplorable diviſions through the whole courſe of the ſucceeding age, and which, to the deep ſorrow and regret of every true and generous Chriſtian, have been continued down to the preſent time. The doctrine of AUGUSTIN, who was of opinion that in the work of converſion and ſanctification, all was to be attributed to a divine energy, and nothing to human agency, had many followers in all ages of the church; though his diſciples have never been entirely agreed about the manner of explaining what he taught upon that head [*k*]. The followers of CASSIAN were, however, much more numerous; and his doctrine, though variouſly explained, was received in the greateſt part of the monaſtic ſchools in *Gaul*, from whence it ſpred itſelf far and wide through the European provinces. As to the Greeks and other eaſtern Chriſtians, they had embraced the Semi-pelagian doctrine before CASSIAN, and ſtill adhere firmly to it. The generality of Chriſtians looked upon the opinions of PELAGIUS as daring and preſumptuous; and even to thoſe who adopted them in ſecret, they appeared too free and too far removed from the notions commonly received, to render the public profeſſion of them adviſeable and prudent. Certain however it is, that in all ages of the church there have been ſeveral perſons, who, in conformity with the doctrine attributed to this heretic, have believed mankind endowed with a *natural power* of paying to the divine laws a *perfect obedience*.

---

not diſpenſe his *grace* to one more than another in conſequence of Predeſtination, *i. e.* an eternal and abſolute decree, but was willing to ſave all men, if they complied with the terms of his goſpel. 2. That CHRIST *died for all men*. 3. That the grace purchaſed by CHRIST, and neceſſary to ſalvation, was offered to all men. 4. That man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy deſires. 5. That man born *free*, was conſequently capable of reſiſting the influences of grace, or *complying* with its ſuggeſtions. See BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. i. p. 696, &c.]

[*i*] JAC. BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. xii. cap. i. *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France* tom. ii. *Præf.* p. 9. VOSSII *Hiſtor. Pelagiana*, lib. v. p. 538. SCIPIO MAFFEI (under the fictitious name of IRENÆUS VERONENSIS) *De Hæreſi Pelagiana in tomo* xxix *Opuſcul. Scientif.* ANGELI, *Calogeræ*, p. 399.

[(*k*) It is well known, that the Janſeniſts and Jeſuits both plead the authority of St. AUGUSTIN, in behalf of their oppoſite ſyſtems with reſpect to predeſtination and grace. This knotty doctrine has exerciſed ſeverely the pretended infallibility of the popes, and expoſed it to the laughter of the wiſe upon many occaſions; and the famous *Bull Unigenitus*, which of late years has made ſuch noiſe, ſet CLEMENT XI. in direct oppoſition with ſeveral of the moſt celebrated Roman pontifs Which are we to believe?]

THE SIXTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events which happened to the church during this century.

The progreſs of the Chriſtian religion in the eaſt.

I. THE zeal of the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, ſeconded by the protection and influence of the Grecian emperors, increaſed the number of Chriſtians in the eaſt, and contributed to the converſion of ſome barbarous nations, of thoſe, particularly, who lived upon the borders of the *Euxine* ſea, as appears by the moſt authentic records of Grecian hiſtory. Among theſe nations were the Abaſgi, who inhabited the country lying between the coaſts of the *Euxine* ſea, and mount *Caucaſus*, and who embraced Chriſtianity under the reign of JUSTINIAN [a]; the Heruli, who dwelt beyond the *Danube*, and who were converted under the ſame reign [b]; as alſo the Alans, Lazi, and Zani, with other uncivilized countries, whoſe ſituation, at this time, is only known by vague and imperfect conjectures. Theſe converſions, indeed, however pompouſly they may ſound, were extremely ſuperficial and imperfect, as we learn from the moſt credible accounts that have been given of them. All that was required of theſe darkened nations amounted to an oral profeſſion of their faith in CHRIST, to their abſtaining from ſacrificing to the gods, and their committing to memory certain forms of doctrine; while little care was taken to enrich their minds with pious ſentiments, or to cultivate in their hearts virtuous affections. So that, even after their converſion to Chriſtianity, they retained their primitive ferocity, and ſavage manners, and continued to diſtinguiſh themſelves by the moſt horrid acts of cruelty and rapine, and the practice of all ſorts of wickedneſs. In the greateſt part of the Grecian provinces, and even in the capital of the eaſtern empire, there were ſtill multitudes who preſerved a ſecret attachment to the Pagan religion. Of theſe vaſt numbers were brought over to Chriſtianity, under the reign of JUSTIN, by the miniſterial labours of JOHN, biſhop of *Aſia* [*c*].

---

[a] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Gothico*, lib. iv. cap. iii. LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1351.

[b] PROCOPIUS, l. c. lib. ii. cap. xiv.

In the weſt.

II. In the weſtern parts, REMIGIUS biſhop of *Rheims*, who is commonly called *The apoſtle of the Gauls*, ſignalized his zeal in the converſion of thoſe who ſtill adhered to the ancient ſuperſtitions [*d*]; and his ſucceſs was conſiderable, particularly after that auſpicious period, when CLOVIS, king of the Franks, embraced the goſpel.

In *Britain* ſeveral circumſtances concurred to favour the propagation of Chriſtianity. ETHELBERT, king of *Kent*, and the moſt conſiderable of the Anglo-Saxon monarchs, among whom that Iſland was, at this time, divided, married BERTHA, daughter of CHEREBERT, king of *Paris*, towards the concluſion of this century. This princeſs, partly by her own influence, and partly by the pious efforts of the clergy, who followed her into *Britain*, gradually formed, in the mind of ETHELBERT, a certain inclination to the Chriſtian religion. While the king was in this favourable diſpoſition, GREGORY the GREAT, ſent into *Britain*, A. D. 596, forty Benedictin monks, with AUGUSTIN at their head [*e*], in order to bring to perfection what the pious queen had ſo happily begun. This monk, ſeconded by the zeal and aſſiſtance of BERTHA, converted the king, and the greateſt part of the inhabitants of *Kent*, and laid anew the foundations of the Britiſh church [*f*].

The labours of COLUMBAS, an Iriſh monk, were attended with ſucceſs among the Picts and Scots, many of whom embraced the goſpel of CHRIST [*g*].

In *Germany*, the Bohemians, Thuringians, and Boii, are ſaid to have abandoned, in this century, their ancient ſuperſtitions [*h*], and to have received the light of divine truth; though this fact appears extremely doubtful to many.

All theſe converſions and ſacred exploits will loſe much of their importance in the eſteem of ſuch, as examine with attention the accounts which have been given of them by the writers of this and the ſucceeding ages. For by theſe accounts it appears, that the converted nations, now mentioned, retained a great part of their former impiety, ſuperſtition, and licentiouſneſs; and that, attached to CHRIST, by a mere outward and nominal profeſſion, they, in effect, renounced the purity of his doctrine, and the authority of his goſpel by their flagitious lives, and the ſuperſtitious and idolatrous rites and inſtitutions which they continued to obſerve [i].

[*c*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNUS, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. ii. p. 85.

[*d*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 155.

[(*e*) This Britiſh apoſtle was prior of the monaſtery of St. ANDREW, of the order of St. BENEDICT, at *Rome*. After his arrival in *England*, he converted the heathen temples into places of Chriſtian worſhip, erected Chriſt-church into a cathedral, opened a ſeminary of learning, founded the abbey of St. AUGUSTIN, received epiſcopal ordination from the primate of *Arles*, was inveſted, by pope GREGORY, with power over all the Britiſh biſhops and Saxon prelates, and was the firſt archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.]

[*f*] BEDE, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Gentis Anglor.* lib i. cap. xxiii. p. 55. edit. Chifleti. RAPIN'S *Hiſtory of England*. *Acta Sanctor.* tom. iii. Februar. p. 470.

[*g*] BEDE, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 134.

[*h*] HENR. CANISII *Lection. Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 208. AVENTINUS, *Annal. Boiorum.*

The Jews converted in ſeveral places.

III. A vaſt multitude of Jews, converted to Chriſtianity in ſeveral places, were added to the church during the courſe of this century. Many in the eaſt, particularly the inhabitants of *Borium*, a city of *Libya*, were brought over to the truth by the perſuaſion and influence of the emperor Justinian [k]. In the weſt, the zeal and authority of the Gallic and Spaniſh monarchs, the efforts of Gregory the Great, and the labours of Avitus biſhop of *Vienne*, engaged numbers of that blinded nation to receive the goſpel. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that of theſe converſions the greateſt part were owing to the liberality of Chriſtian princes, or to the fear of puniſhment, rather than to the force of argument or to the love of truth. In *Gaul*, the Jews were compelled, by Childeric, to receive the ordinance of baptiſm; and the ſame deſpotic method of converting was practiſed in *Spain* [l]. This method, however, was entirely diſapproved by Gregory the Great, who, though extremely ſevere upon the heretics, would ſuffer no violence to be offered to the Jews [m].

The miracles of this century.

IV. If credit is to be given to the writers of this century, the converſion of theſe uncivilized nations to Chriſtianity was principally effected by the prodigies and miracles which the heralds of the goſpel were enabled to work in its behalf. But the conduct of the converted nations is ſufficient to invalidate the force of theſe teſtimonies: for certainly had ſuch miracles been wrought among them, their lives would have been more ſuitable to their profeſſion, and their attachment and obedience to the doctrines and laws of the goſpel more ſtedfaſt and exemplary, than they appear to have been. Beſides, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, in abandoning their ancient ſuperſtitions, the greateſt part of them were more influenced by the example and authority of their princes, than by force of argument, or the power of a rational conviction. And, indeed, if we conſider the wretched manner in which many of the firſt Chriſtian miſſionaries performed the ſolemn taſk they had undertaken, we ſhall perceive that they wanted not many arguments to enforce the doctrines they taught, and the diſcipline they recommended; for they required nothing of theſe barbarous people that was difficult to be performed, or that laid any remarkable reſtraint upon their appetites and paſſions. The principal injunctions they impoſed upon theſe rude proſelytes

[i] This is ingenuouſly confeſſed by the Benedictin monks, in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. Introduc. p. 8. 11. 13. See alſo the orders given to the Anglo-Saxons by Gregory the Great, in his *Epiſt.* lib. xi. lxxvi. p. 1176. tom. ii. Opp. edit. Benedict. where we find him permitting them to ſacrifice to the ſaints, on their reſpective holidays, the victims which they had formerly offered to the gods. See alſo Wilkins's *Concilia Magnæ Brittanniæ*, tom. i. p. 18.

[k] Procopius, *De ædificiis Juſtiniani*, lib. vi. cap. ii.

[l] Greg. Turon. *Hiſtor. Francor.* lib. vi. cap. xvii. Launoius, *De veteri more baptizandi Judæos et infideles*, cap. i. p. 700. 704. tom. ii. part. II. Opp.

[m] See his *Epiſtles*, book i. *ep.* xlvii. tom. ii. Opp. p. 541. edit. Benedict. particularly thoſe which he wrote to Virgilius of *Arles*, Theodorus of *Marſeilles*, and Peter of *Taracina*.

were, that they ſhould get by heart certain ſummaries of doctrine, and pay to the images of CHRIST and the ſaints the ſame religious ſervices which they had formerly offered to the ſtatues of the gods. Nor were they at all delicate or ſcrupulous in chuſing the means of eſtabliſhing their credit; for they looked upon it as lawful, nay even meritorious, to deceive an ignorant and inattentive multitude, by repreſenting to them, as prodigies, things that were merely natural, as we learn from the moſt authentic records of theſe times.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

Some remains of Paganiſm are to be found in this century.

I. THOUGH the abjuration of Paganiſm was, by the imperial laws, made a neceſſary ſtep to preferment, and to the exerciſing all public offices; yet ſeveral perſons, reputed for their erudition and gravity of manners, perſiſted in their adherence to the ancient ſuperſtition. TRIBONIAN, the famous compiler of the Roman law, is thought, by ſome, to have been among the number of thoſe who continued in their prejudices againſt the Chriſtian religion; and ſuch alſo, in the opinion of many, was the caſe of PROCOPIUS the celebrated hiſtorian. It is, at leaſt, undoubtedly certain, that AGATHIAS, who was an eminent lawyer at *Smyrna*, and who had alſo acquired a conſiderable reputation as an hiſtorical writer, perſevered in his attachment to the Pagan worſhip. Theſe illuſtrious Gentiles were exempted from the ſeverities which were employed frequently to engage the lower orders to abandon the ſervice of the gods. The rigour of the laws, as it uſually happens in human life, fell only upon thoſe who had neither rank, fortune, nor court-favour to ward off their execution.

Several write againſt Chriſtianity.

II. Surprized as we may be at the protection granted to the perſons now mentioned, and that at a time when the goſpel was, in many inſtances, propagated by unchriſtian methods; it will appear ſtill more aſtoniſhing, that the Platonic philoſophers, whoſe oppoſition to Chriſtianity was univerſally known, ſhould be permitted, in *Greece* and *Egypt*, to teach publicly the tenets of their ſect, which were abſolutely incompatible with the doctrines of the goſpel. Theſe doctors indeed affected, generally ſpeaking, a high degree of moderation and prudence; and, for the moſt part, modified their expreſſions in ſuch a manner, as to give to the Pagan ſyſtem an evangelical aſpect, extremely adapted to deceive the unwary; as the examples of CHALCIDIUS [n],

---

[(n) The religion of CHALCIDIUS has been much diſputed among the learned. CAVE ſeems inclined to rank him among the Chriſtian writers, though he expreſſes ſome uncertainty about the matter. HUET, G. J. VOSSIUS, FABRICIUS, and BEAUSOBRE, decide with ſomewhat more aſſurance that CHALCIDIUS was a Chriſtian. Some learned men have maintained, on the contrary, that many things in the writings of this ſage intitle him to a place among the Pagan philoſophers. Our learned author, in his notes to his Latin tranſlation of CUDWORTH's *Intellectual Syſtem*, and in a *Diſſertation de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Eccleſia*, lays down an and Alexander of *Lycopolis*, abundantly teſtify [o]. Some of them, however, were leſs modeſt; nay, carried their audacious efforts againſt Chriſtianity ſo far as to revile it publicly. Damascius, in the life of Isodorus, and in other places, caſts upon the Chriſtians the moſt ignominious aſperſions [p]; Simplicius, in his illuſtrations of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, throws out ſeveral malignant inſinuations againſt the doctrines of the goſpel; and the *Epicheiremata* of Proclus wrote expreſly againſt the diſciples of Jesus, were univerſally red, and were, on that account, accurately refuted by Philoponus [q]. All this ſhews, that many of the magiſtrates, who were witneſſes of theſe calumnious attempts againſt the goſpel, were not ſo much Chriſtians in reality, as in appearance; otherwiſe, they would not have permitted the ſlanders of theſe licentious revilers to paſs without correction or reſtraint.

The ſufferings of the Chriſtians in ſeveral places.

III. Notwithſtanding the extenſive progreſs of the goſpel, the Chriſtians, even in this century, ſuffered grievouſly, in ſeveral places, from the ſavage cruelty and bitterneſs of their enemies. In *Britain*, the Anglo-Saxons, who were maſters of that kingdom, involved a multitude of its ancient inhabitants, who profeſſed Chriſtianity, in the deepeſt diſtreſſes, and tormented them with all that variety of ſuffering, which the injurious and malignant ſpirit of perſecution could invent [r]. The Huns, in their irruption into

---

hypotheſis, which holds the middle way between theſe two extremes. He is of opinion, that Chalcidius neither rejected nor embraced the whole ſyſtem of the Chriſtian doctrine, but ſelected out of the religion of Jesus and the tenets of Plato, a body of divinity, in which, however, Platoniſm was predominant; and that he was one of thoſe Syneretiſt or Eclectic philoſophers who abounded in the fourth and fifth centuries, and who attempted the uniting Paganiſm and Chriſtianity into one motley ſyſtem. This account of the matter, however, appears too vague to the celebrated author of the *Critical Hiſtory of Philoſophy*, M. Brucker. This excellent writer agrees with Dr. Mosheim in this, that Chalcidius followed the motley method of the eclectic Platoniſts, but does not ſee any thing in this inconſiſtent with his having publicly profeſſed the Chriſtian religion. For the queſtion is not, whether this philoſopher was a ſound and orthodox Chriſtian, which Mr. Brucker denies him to have been, but whether he had abandoned the Pagan rites, and made a public profeſſion of Chriſtianity; and this our philoſophical hiſtorian looks upon as evident. For though, in the commentary upon Plato's *Timæus*, Chalcidius teaches ſeveral doctrines that ſeem to ſtrike at the foundations of our holy religion, yet the ſame may be ſaid of Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius, and others, who are, nevertheleſs, reckoned among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity. The reader will find a moſt excellent view of the different opinions concerning the religion of Chalcidius, in the *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ* Bruckeri, tom. iii. p. 472—485. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this, that the Eclectics, before Chriſtianity became the religion of the ſtate, enriched their ſyſtem from the goſpel, but ranged themſelves under the ſtandards of Plato; and repaired to thoſe of Christ, without any conſiderable change of their ſyſtem, when the examples and authority of the emperors rendered the profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion a matter of prudence, as well as its own excellence rendered it moſt juſtly a matter of choice.]

[(o) Alexander wrote a treatiſe againſt the Manichæans, which is publiſhed by Combefis, in the ſecond tome of his *Auctar. Noviſſ. Biblioth. PP.* Photius, Combefis, and our learned Cave, looked upon Alexander as a proſelyte to Chriſtianity. But Beausobre has demonſtrated the contrary. See *Hiſtoire de Manicheiſme*, part. II. *Diſcours Preliminaire*, § 13. p. 236.]

[p] Photius, *Bibliothecæ Cod.* ccxlii. p. 1027.

[q] See J. A. Fabricii *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iii. p. 522.

[r] Usserii *Index Chronol. Antiquit. Eccleſ. Britann. ſubjectus ad A.* dviii. p. 1123.

Thrace, *Greece*, and the other provinces, during the reign of JUSTINIAN, treated the Chriſtians with great barbarity; not ſo much, perhaps, from an averſion to Chriſtianity, as from an hoſtile ſpirit of hatred againſt the Greeks, and a deſire of overturning and deſtroying their empire. The face of affairs was totally changed in *Italy*, about the middle of this century, by a grand revolution which happened under the reign of JUSTINIAN I. This emperor, by the arms of NARSES, overturned the kingdom of the Oſtrogoths, which had ſubſiſted ninety years; and ſubdued all *Italy* under his dominion. The ſtate of things, however, which this revolution introduced, was not of a very long duration; for the Lombards, a fierce and warlike people, headed by ALBOINUS their king, and joined by ſeveral other German nations, iſſued forth from *Pannonia*, in the year 568, under the reign of JUSTIN, invaded *Italy*; and, having made themſelves maſters of the whole country, except *Rome* and *Ravenna*, erected a new kingdom at *Ticinum*. Under theſe new tyrants, who, to the natural ferocity of their characters, added an averſion to the religion of JESUS, the Chriſtians, in the beginning, endured calamities of every kind. But the fury of theſe ſavage uſurpers gradually ſubſided, and their manners contracted, from time to time, a milder character. AUTHARIS, the third monarch of the Lombards, embraced Chriſtianity, as it was profeſſed by the Arians, in the year 587. But his ſucceſſor AGILULF, who married his widow THEUDELINDA, was perſuaded, by that princeſs, to abandon Arianiſm, and to adopt the tenets of the Nicene Catholics [s].

But the calamities of the Chriſtians, in all other countries, were light and inconſiderable in compariſon of thoſe which they ſuffered in *Perſia* under CHOSROES, the inhuman monarch of that nation. This monſter of impiety aimed his audacious and deſperate efforts againſt heaven itſelf; for he publicly declared, that he would make war not only upon JUSTINIAN, but alſo upon the God of the Chriſtians; and, in conſequence of this blaſphemous menace, he vented his rage againſt the followers of JESUS in the moſt barbarous manner, and put multitudes of them to the moſt cruel and ignominious deaths [t].

---

[s] PAUL. DIACON. *De geſtis Longobardorum*, lib. ii. cap. ii. xxvii. p. 219. 231. edit. Lindenbrogii. MURATORII *Antiqu. Italiæ*, tom. i. p. 14. tom. ii. p. 297. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 302.

[t] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Perſico*, lib. ii. cap. xxvi.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters in the weſt.

I. THE incurſions of the barbarous nations into the greateſt part of the weſtern provinces, were extremely prejudicial to the intereſts of learning and philoſophy, as muſt be known to all who have any acquaintance with the hiſtory of thoſe unhappy times. During thoſe tumultuous ſcenes of deſolation and horror, the liberal arts and ſciences would have been totally extinguiſhed, had they not found a place of refuge, ſuch as it was, among the biſhops and the monaſtic orders. Here they aſſembled their ſcattered remains, and received a degree of culture which juſt ſerved to keep them from periſhing. Thoſe churches, which were diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Cathedrals*, had ſchools erected under their juriſdiction, in which the biſhop, or a certain perſon appointed by him, inſtructed the youth in the *ſeven liberal arts*, as a preparatory introduction to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures [*a*]. Perſons of both ſexes, who had devoted themſelves to the monaſtic life, were obliged, by the founders of their reſpective orders, to employ daily a certain portion of their time in reading the ancient doctors of the church, whoſe writings were looked upon as the rich repertories of celeſtial wiſdom, in which all the treaſures of theology were centered [*b*]. Hence libraries were formed in all the monaſteries, and the pious and learned productions of the Chriſtian and other writers were copied and diſperſed by the diligence of tranſcribers appointed for that purpoſe, who were generally ſuch monks as, by weakneſs of conſtitution or other bodily infirmities, were rendered incapable of harder labour. To theſe eſtabliſhments we owe the preſervation and poſſeſſion of all the ancient authors ſacred and profane, who eſcaped, in this manner, the ſavage fury of Gothic ignorance, and are happily tranſmitted to our times. It is alſo to be obſerved, that, beſides the ſchools that belonged to the cathedrals, there were others opened in the monaſteries; in which the youth, who were ſet apart for the monaſtic life, were inſtructed by the abbot, or ſome of his eccleſiaſtics, in the arts and ſciences [*c*].

---

[a] FLEURY, *Diſcours ſur* } *l'Hiſtoire Eccleſ. depuis l'an* 600, &c. § 21. p. 56. tom. xiii. *de l'Hiſtoire Eccleſ.*—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iii. Intr. § 32. p. 12. HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 66—167. edit. Heummann.

[b] BENEDICTI ANIANENSIS *Concordia Regularum*, lib. ii. p. 55. 64. 75. 77. 80. 100. lib. iii. p. 16—41, &c. edit. Hug. Menardi. JO. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. 44.

[c] BENEDICT. *Concord. Reg.* lib. ii. p. 232. MABILLON, *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* tom. i. p. 314.

The ſciences are taught very imperfectly.

II. But theſe inſtitutions and eſtabliſhments, however laudable, did not produce ſuch happy effects as might have been expected from them. For not to ſpeak of the indolence of certain abbots and biſhops, who neglected entirely the duties of their ſtations, nor of the bitter averſion which others diſcovered towards every ſort of learning and erudition, which they conſidered as pernicious to the progreſs of piety [*d*]; not to ſpeak of the *illiberal ignorance* which ſeveral prelates affected, and which they injudiciouſly confounded with *Chriſtian ſimplicity* [*e*]; even thoſe who applied themſelves to the ſtudy and propagation of the ſciences, were, for the moſt part, extremely unſkilful and illiterate; and the branches of learning taught in thoſe ſchools, were inconſiderable both as to their quality and their number [*f*]. Greek literature was almoſt every where neglected; and thoſe who, by profeſſion, had devoted themſelves to the culture of Latin erudition, ſpent their time and labour in grammatical ſubtilties and quibbles; as the pedantic examples of ISIDORUS and CASSIODORUS abundantly ſhew. Eloquence was degraded into a rhetorical bombaſt, a noiſy kind of declamation, which was compoſed of motley and frigid allegories and barbarous terms, as may even appear from ſeveral parts of the writings of thoſe ſuperior geniuſes who ſurpaſſed their cotemporaries in preciſion and elegance; ſuch as BOETHIUS, CASSIODORUS, ENNODIUS, and others. As to the other liberal arts, they ſhared the common calamity; and, as they were now cultivated, had nothing very liberal or elegant in their appearance, conſiſting entirely in a few dry rules, which, inſtead of a complete and finiſhed ſyſtem, produced only a ghaſtly and lifeleſs ſkeleton.

The ſtudy of philoſophy decried.

III. Philoſophy fared ſtill worſe than literature: for it was entirely baniſhed from all the ſeminaries which were under the inſpection and government of the eccleſiaſtical order. The greateſt part of theſe zealots looked upon the ſtudy of philoſophy not only as uſeleſs, but even pernicious to thoſe who had dedicated themſelves to the ſervice of religion. The moſt eminent, nay almoſt the only Latin philoſopher of this age, was the celebrated BOETHIUS, privy counſellor to THEODORIC, king of the Oſtrogoths in *Italy*. This illuſtrious ſenator had embraced the Platonic philoſophy [*g*]; but approved alſo, as was uſual among the latter Platonics, the doctrine of ARISTOTLE, and illuſtrated it in his writings. And it was undoubtedly owing to the diligence and zeal with which he explained and recommended the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, that it roſe now among the Latins to a higher degree of credit, than it had hitherto enjoyed.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

IV. The ſtate of the liberal arts among the Greeks was, in ſeveral places, much more flouriſhing than that in which we have left them among the

---

[*d*] GREGORY the GREAT is ſaid to have been of this number, and to have ordered a multitude of the productions of Pagan writers; and among others, LIVY's *Roman Hiſtory* to be committed to the flames. See GABRIEL LIRON, *Singularités Hiſtor. et Litter.* tom. i. p. 166.

[*e*] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedict.* p. 46.

[*f*] See M. AUR. CASSIODORI *Liber de ſeptem Diſciplinis*, which is extant among his works.

[*g*] This will appear evident to ſuch as, with a competent knowledge of the latter Platoniſm, read attentively the books of BOETIUS, *De conſolatione*, &c. See alſo, on this ſubject, RENAT. VALL. p. 10. 50. HOLSTENIUS *in vita Porphyrii*, p. 7. edit. Cantabr. See alſo MASCOV. *Hiſtor. Germanor.* tom. ii. p. 102.

Latins; and the emperors raiſed and nouriſhed a ſpirit of literary emulation, by the noble rewards and the diſtinguiſhed honours which they attached to the purſuit of all the various branches of learning [*h*]. It is, however, certain, that notwithſtanding theſe encouragements, the ſciences were cultivated with leſs ardour, and men of learning and genius were leſs numerous than in the preceding century.

In the beginning of this, the later Platonics maintained as yet their credit, and their philoſophy was in vogue. The Alexandrian and Athenian ſchools flouriſhed, under the direction of DAMASCIUS, ISIDORUS, SIMPLICIUS, EULAMIUS, HERMIAS, PRISCIANUS, and others, who were placed on the higheſt ſummit of literary glory. But when the emperor JUSTINIAN, by a particular edict, prohibited the teaching philoſophy at *Athens* [*i*] (which edict, no doubt, was levelled at the modern Platoniſm already mentioned) and when his reſentment began to flame out againſt thoſe who refuſed to abandon the Pagan worſhip, then all theſe celebrated philoſophers took refuge among the Perſians, who were, at that time, the enemies of *Rome* [*k*]. They, indeed, returned from their voluntary exile, when the peace was concluded between the Perſians and the Romans A D. 533 [*l*]; but they could never recover their former credit, and they gradually diſappeared in the public ſchools and ſeminaries of learning, which ceaſed, at length, to be under their direction.

Thus expired that famous ſect, which was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the Modern or Later Platonic; and which, for a ſeries of ages, had produced ſuch diviſions and tumults in the Chriſtian church, and been, in other reſpects, prejudicial to the intereſts and progreſs of the goſpel. It was ſucceeded by the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, which aroſe imperceptibly out of its obſcurity, and was placed in an advantageous light by the illuſtrations of the learned; but eſpecially and principally by the celebrated commentaries of PHILOPONUS. And, indeed, the knowledge of this philoſophy was neceſſary for the Greeks; ſince it was from the depths of this peripatetical wiſdom, that the Monophyſites and Neſtorians drew the ſubtilties with which they endeavoured to overwhelm the abettors of the Epheſian and Chalcedonian councils.

In the eaſt.

V. The Neſtorians and Monophyſites, who lived in the eaſt, turned equally their eyes towards ARISTOTLE; and, in order to train their reſpective followers to the field of controverſy, and arm them with the ſubtilties of a contentious logic, tranſlated the principal books of that deep philoſopher into their native languages. SERGIUS, a Monophyſite and philoſopher, tranſlated the books of ARISTOTLE into Syriac [*m*]. URANIUS, a Syrian, propagated the doctrines of this philoſopher in *Perſia*; and diſpoſed in their favour CHOSROES, the monarch of that nation, who became a zealous abettor of the peripatetic

[h] See the *Codex Theodoſ.* tom. ii. lib. vi. p. 113. HERM. CONRINGIUS, *De ſtudiis urbis Romæ et Conſtantinop.* in a Diſſertation ſubjoined to his *Antiquitates Academicæ.*

[i] JOHANNES MALELA, *Hiſtoria Chronica*, part. II. p. 187. edit. Oxon. Another teſtimony concerning this matter is cited from a certain *Chronicle*, not yet publiſhed, by NIC. ALEMANNUS, *ad Procopii Hiſtor. Arcanam*, cap. xxvi. p. 377. edit. Venet.

[k] AGATHIAS, *De rebus Juſtiniani*, lib. ii. p. 49. edit. Venet. tom. ii. *Corpor. Byzant.*

[l] See WESSELINGII *Obſervat. Variar.* lib. i. cap. xviii. p. 117.

[m] GEORGIUS ABULPHARAIUS, *Hiſtoria Dynaſtiar.* publiſhed by Dr. POCOCK, p. 94, 172.

ſyſtem [n]. The ſame prince received from one of the Neſtorian faction (which, after having procured the excluſion of the Greeks, triumphed at this time unrivalled in *Perſia)* a tranſlation of the Stagirite into the Perſian language [o].

It is, however, to be obſerved, that among theſe eaſtern Chriſtians there were ſome who rejected both the Platonic and Ariſtotelian doctrines; and, unwilling to be obliged to others for their philoſophical knowledge, invented ſyſtems of their own, which were inexpreſſibly chimerical and pregnant with abſurdities. Of this claſs of original philoſophers was COSMAS, a Neſtorian, commonly called Indicopleuſtes, whoſe doctrines are extremely ſingular, and reſemble more the notions of the Orientals than the opinions of the Greeks [p]. Such alſo was the writer, from whoſe *Expoſition of the Octateuch*, PHOTIUS has drawn ſeveral citations [q].

CHAP. I[illegible]

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church.

Diſputes between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople.*

I. THE external form of church government continued without any remarkable alteration during the courſe of this century. But the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, who were conſidered as the moſt eminent and principal rulers of the Chriſtian church, were engaged in perpetual diſputes about the extent and limits of their reſpective juriſdictions, and ſeemed both to aſpire at the ſupreme authority in eccleſiaſtical matters. The biſhop of *Conſtantinople* not only claimed an unrivalled ſovereignty over the eaſtern churches, but alſo maintained, that his church was, in point of dignity, no way inferior to that of *Rome*. The Roman pontifs beheld, with impatience, theſe lordly pretenſions, and warmly aſſerted the pre-eminence of their church, and its undoubted ſuperiority over that of *Conſtantinople*. GREGORY the GREAT, diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this violent conteſt; and the following event furniſhed him with an opportunity of exerting his zeal. In the year 588, JOHN biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, ſurnamed the FASTER, on account of his extraordinary abſtinence and auſterity, aſſembled, by his own authority, a council at *Conſtantinople*, to inquire into an accuſation brought againſt PETER patriarch of *Antioch*; and, upon this occaſion, aſſumed the title of *œcumenical*, or *univerſal biſhop* [r]. Now, although this title had been formerly enjoyed

---

[n] See AGATHIAS, *De rebus Juſtiniani*, lib. ii. p. 48. That URANIUS made uſe of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy in the Eutychian controverſy is evident even from this ſingle circumſtance, that AGATHIAS repreſents him diſputing concerning the *paſſibility* and *immiſcibility* of God (ϗ τὸ παθητὸν και ἀξύγχυτον).

[o] AGATHIAS, l. c. lib. ii. p. 48. edit. Venet.

[p] BERNARD de MONTFAUCON *Præfat. ad Coſmam*, p. 10. tom. ii. *Collectionis novæ patrum Gæcorum*.

[q] *Biblioth. Codic*, xxxvi. p. 22, 23.

[(r) We cannot avoid taking notice of ſome miſtakes which have ſlipped from the pen of Dr. MOSHEIM in his narration of this event. *Firſt*, The council here mentioned was held under the pontificate of PELAGIUS II, and not of GREGORY the GREAT, who was not choſen biſhop of *Rome* before A. D. 590. *Secondly*, The perſon accuſed before this council was not by the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, and was alſo ſuſceptible of an interpretation that might have prevented its giving umbrage or offence to any [*s*], yet Gregory ſuſpected, both from the time and the occaſion of John's renewing his claim to it, that he was aiming at a ſupremacy over all the Chriſtian churches; and therefore he oppoſed his claim in the moſt vigorous manner in letters to that purpoſe addreſſed to the emperor, and to ſuch perſons as he judged proper to ſecond his oppoſition. But all his efforts were without effect; and the biſhops of *Conſtantinople* continued to aſſume the title in queſtion, though not in the ſenſe, in which it had alarmed the Roman pontif [*t*].

The Roman pontif ſtruggles hard for univerſal dominion.

II. This pontif, however, adhered tenaciouſly to his purpoſe, oppoſed with vehemence the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, raiſed new tumults and diſſenſions among the ſacred order, and aimed at no leſs than an unlimited ſupremacy over the Chriſtian church. This ambitious deſign ſucceeded in the weſt; while, in the eaſtern provinces, his arrogant pretenſions were ſcarcely reſpected by any but thoſe who were at enmity with the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; and this prelate was always in a condition to make head againſt the progreſs of his authority in the eaſt. How much the opinions of ſome were favourable to the lordly demands of the Roman pontifs, may be eaſily imagined from an expreſſion of Ennodius, that infamous and extravagant flatterer of Symmachus, who was a prelate of but ambiguous fame. This paraſitical panegyriſt, among other impertinent aſſertions, maintained, that the Roman pontif was conſtituted *judge in the place of God*, which he filled as the vicegerent of the moſt high [*u*]. On the other hand, it is certain, from a variety of the moſt authentic records, that both the emperors, and the nations in general were far from being diſpoſed to bear with patience the yoke of ſervitude, which the ſee of *Rome* was arrogantly impoſing upon the Chriſtian church [*w*]. The Gothic princes ſet bounds to the power of the biſhop of *Rome* in *Italy*, permitted none to be raiſed to the pontificate without their approbation, and reſerved to themſelves the right of judging concerning the legality of every new election [*x*]. They enacted ſpiritual laws, called the religious orders before their tribunals, and ſummoned councils by their regal authority [*y*].

Peter, but Gregory biſhop of *Antioch*. *Thirdly*, It does not appear that the council was ſummoned by John of *Conſtantinople*, but by the emperor Mauricius, to whom Gregory had appealed from the governor of the eaſt, before whom he was firſt accuſed.]

[(*s*) The title of *univerſal biſhop*, which had been given by Leo and Justinian to the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, was not attended with any acceſſion of power.]

[*t*] Gregor. Magni *Epiſt*. lib. iv, v. vii. All the paſſages in theſe epiſtles, that relate to this famous conteſt, have been extracted and illuſtrated by Launoius, in his *Aſſertio in Privileg. S. Medardi*, tom. iii. Opp. part. II. p. 266. See alſo Lequien, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 67. Pfaffii *Diſſertatio de titulo Oecumenicus*, in the *Tempe Helvetica*, tom. iv. p. 99.

[*u*] See his *Apologeticum pro Synodo*, in the xv volume of the *Bibliotheca Magna patrum*, p. 248. edit. Paris. [One would think that this ſervile adulator had never red the 4th verſe of the iid chapter of *St.* Paul's 2d *Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians*, where the *Anti-Chriſt*, or *man of ſin*, is deſcribed in the very terms in which he repreſents the authority of the pontif Symmachus.

[*w*] See particularly the truth of this aſſertion, with reſpect to *Spain*, in Geddes's *Diſſertation on the Papal Supremacy, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spaniſh church*, which is to be found in the ſecond volume of his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*.

[*x*] See Jo. Jac. Mascovii *Hiſtor. Germanor*. tom. ii. not. p. 113.

[*y*] Basnage, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformés*, tom. i. p. 381.

In conſequence of all this, the pontifs, amidſt all their high pretenſions, reverenced the majeſty of their kings and emperors, and ſubmitted to their authority with the moſt profound humility; nor were they, as yet, ſo loſt to all ſenſe of ſhame, as to aim at the ſubjection of kings and princes to their ghoſtly dominion [z].

Vices and corruption of the clergy.

III. The rights and privileges of the clergy were very conſiderable before this period, and the riches, which they had accumulated, immenſe: and both received daily augmentations from the growth of ſuperſtition in this century. The arts of a rapacious prieſthood were practiſed upon the ignorant devotion of the ſimple; and even the remorſe of the wicked was made an inſtrument of increaſing the eccleſiaſtical treaſure. For an opinion was propagated with induſtry among the people, that the remiſſion of their ſins was to be purchaſed by their liberalities to the churches and monks, and that the prayers of departed ſaints, whoſe efficacy was victorious at the throne of God, were to be bought by offerings preſented to the temples, which were conſecrated to theſe celeſtial mediators. But in proportion as the riches of the church increaſed, the various orders of the clergy were infected with thoſe vices that are too often the conſequences of an affluent proſperity. This appears, with the utmoſt evidence, from the imperial edicts and the decrees of councils, which were ſo frequently levelled at the immoralities of thoſe who were diſtinguiſhed by the name of *clerks*. For whence ſo many laws to reſtrain the vices, and to preſerve the morals of the eccleſiaſtical orders, if they had fulfilled even the obligations of external decency, or ſhewn, in the general tenor of their lives, a certain degree of reſpect for religion and virtue? Be that as it will, the effect of all theſe laws and edicts was ſo inconſiderable as to be ſcarcely perceived; for ſo high was the veneration paid, at this time, to the clergy, that their moſt flagitious crimes were corrected by the ſlighteſt and gentleſt puniſhments; an unhappy circumſtance, which added to their preſumption, and rendered them more daring and audacious in iniquity.

The biſhops of *Rome* not excepted.

IV. The biſhops of *Rome*, who conſidered themſelves as the chiefs and fathers of the Chriſtian church, are not to be excepted from this cenſure, any more than the clergy who were under their juriſdiction. We may form ſome notion of their humility and virtue by that long and vehement contention, which aroſe in the year 498, between SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS, who were, on the ſame day, elected to the pontificate by different parties, and whoſe diſpute was, at length, decided by THEODORIC king of the Goths. Each of theſe eccleſiaſtics maintained obſtinately the validity of his election; they reciprocally accuſed each other of the moſt deteſtable crimes; and to their mutual diſhonour, their accuſations did not appear, on either ſide, entirely deſtitute of foundation. Three different councils aſſembled at *Rome*, endeavoured to terminate this odious ſchiſm [a], but without ſucceſs. A fourth was ſummoned, by THEODORIC, to examine the accuſations brought againſt SYMMACHUS, to whom this prince had, at the beginning of the ſchiſm, adjudged the papal chair. This council was held about the commencement of this century, and in it the Roman pontif was acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. But the adverſe party refuſed to acquieſce in this deciſion; and this gave occaſion to ENNODIUS of *Ticinum*, now *Pavia*, to draw up his adulatory *apology for the council and* SYMMACHUS [*b*]. In this apology, which diſguiſes the truth under the ſeducing colours of a gaudy rhetoric, the reader will perceive that the foundations of that enormous power, which the popes of *Rome* afterwards acquired, were now laid; but he will ſeek in vain in this laboured production any ſatisfactory proof of the injuſtice of the charge brought againſt SYMMACHUS [*c*].

---

[z] See the citations from GREGORY the GREAT, collected by LAUNOIS, *De regia poteſtate in matrimon.* tom. i. Opp. part. II. p. 691. and in his *Aſſertio in Privilegium S. Medardi*, p. 272. tom. iii. Opp. part. II. See alſo GIANNONE, *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 282.

[(a) This ſchiſm may be truly termed odious, as it was carried on by aſſaſſinations, maſſacres, and all the cruel proceedings of a deſperate civil war. See PAUL. DIACONUS, lib. xvii.]

The growth of the monks.

V. The number, credit, and influence of the monks augmented daily in all parts of the Chriſtian world. They multiplied ſo prodigiouſly in the eaſt, that whole armies might have been raiſed out of the monaſtic order, without any ſenſible diminution of that enormous body. The monaſtic life was alſo highly honoured, and had an incredible number of patrons and followers in all the weſtern provinces, as appears from the rules which were preſcribed, in this century, by various doctors for directing the conduct of the cloiſtered monks and the Holy Virgins that had ſacrificed their capacity of being uſeful in the world, to the gloomy charms of a convent [*d*]. In *Great Britain*, a certain abbot, named CONGALL, is ſaid to have perſuaded an incredible number of perſons to abandon the affairs, obligations, and duties of ſocial life, and to ſpend the remainder of their days in ſolitude under a rule of diſcipline, of which he was the inventor [*e*]. His diſciples travelled through many countries, in which they propagated, with ſuch ſucceſs, the contagion of this monaſtic devotion, that, in ſome time, *Ireland*, *Gaul*, *Germany*, and *Switzerland* ſwarmed with thoſe lazy orders, and were, in a manner, covered with convents. The moſt illuſtrious diſciple of the abbot now mentioned, was COLUMBAN, whoſe ſingular rule of diſcipline is yet extant, and ſurpaſſes all the reſt in ſimplicity and brevity [*f*]. The monaſtic orders, in general, abounded with fanatics and profligates; the *latter* were more numerous than the *former* in the weſtern convents, while, in thoſe of the eaſt, the fanatics were predominant.

[*b*] This *apology* may be ſeen in the xv volume of the *Magn. Bibl. Patrum*, p. 248.

[(*c*) That SYMMACHUS was never fairly acquitted, may be preſumed from the *firſt*, and proved from the *ſecond* of the following circumſtances: *Firſt*, That THEODORIC, who was a wiſe and equitable prince, and who had attentively examined the charge brought againſt him, would not have referred the deciſion to the biſhops, if the matter had been clear, but would have pronounced judgment himſelf, as he had formerly done concerning the legality of his election. The *ſecond* circumſtance againſt SYMMACHUS is, that the council acquitted him without ſo much as hearing thoſe who accuſed him; and he himſelf did not appear, though frequently ſummoned.]

[*d*] Theſe are in HOLSTENIUS's *Codex Regularum*, part. II. which work was publiſhed at *Rome* in three volumes 4to, in the year 1661. See alſo EDM. MARTENE et URSIN. DURAND. *Theſaur. Anecdot. Nov.* tom. i. p. 4.

[*e*] JAC. USSERII *Antiq. Eccleſ. Britan.*

[*f*] USSERII *Sylloge Antiquar. Epiſtolar. Hibernicar.* p. 5—15. HOLSTENII *Codex Regularum*, tom. ii. p. 48. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæculum* ii. *Benedictinum*, p. 4.

The riſe of the Benedictin order.

VI. A new order of monks, which in a manner abſorbed all the others that were eſtabliſhed in the weſt, was inſtituted, A. D. 529, by BENEDICT of *Nurſia*, a man of piety and reputation for the age he lived in. From his *rule* of diſcipline, which is yet extant, we learn that it was not his intention to impoſe it upon all the monaſtic ſocieties, but to form an order whoſe diſcipline ſhould be milder, their eſtabliſhment more ſolid, and their manners more regular than thoſe of the other Monaſtic bodies; and whoſe members, during the courſe of a holy and peaceful life, were to divide their time between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labours [g]. But, in proceſs of time, the followers of this celebrated eccleſiaſtic degenerated ſadly from the piety of their founder, and loſt ſight of the duties of their ſtation and the great end of their eſtabliſhment. Having acquired immenſe riches from the devout liberality of the opulent, they ſunk into luxury, intemperance, and ſloth, abandoned themſelves to all ſorts of vices, extended their zeal and attention to worldly affairs, inſinuated themſelves into the cabinets of princes, took part in political cabals and court factions, made a vaſt augmentation of ſuperſtitious rites and ceremonies in their order to blind the multitude, and ſupply the place of their expiring virtue; and, among other *meritorious* enterprizes, laboured moſt ardently to ſwell the arrogance, by enlarging the power and authority, of the Roman pontif. The good BENEDICT never dreamt that the great purpoſes of his inſtitution were to be thus perverted, much leſs did he give any encouragement or permiſſion to ſuch flagrant abuſes. His rule of diſcipline was neither favourable to luxury nor ambition; and it is ſtill celebrated on account of its excellence, though it has not been obſerved for many ages.

It is proper to obſerve here, that the inſtitution of BENEDICT changed, in ſeveral reſpects, the obligations and duties of the monaſtic life as it was regulated in the weſt. Among other things, he obliged thoſe who entered into his order to promiſe, at the time of their being received as Novitiates; and afterwards, at their *admiſſion* as members of the ſociety, to perſevere in an obedience to the rules he had laid down, without attempting to change them in any reſpect. As he was extremely ſolicitous about the ſtability of his inſtitution, this particular regulation was wiſe and prudent; and it was ſo much the more neceſſary, that, before his time, the monks made no ſcruple of altering the laws and rules of their founders as often as they thought proper [h].

Its rapid progreſs.

VII. This new order made a moſt rapid progreſs in the weſt; and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, arrived at the moſt flouriſhing ſtate. In *Gaul*, its intereſts were promoted by MAURUS; in *Sicily* and *Sardinia*, by PLACIDUS; in *England* by AUGUSTIN and MELLITUS; in *Italy*, and other countries, by GREGORY the GREAT, who is himſelf reported to have been for ſome time a member of this ſociety [i]; and it was afterwards received in *Germany* by the means of BONIFACE.

---

[g] See MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* i. and *Annales Ordin. Benedict.* tom. i. See alſo HELYOTUS and the other writers, who have given accounts of the monaſtic orders.

[h] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part. I. p. 18.

[i] See MABILLON, *Diſſ. de vita Monaſtica Gregorii M. ad Hadr. Valeſium*, tom. ii. *Analect.*

Boniface [k]. This ſudden and amazing progreſs of the new order was aſcribed, by the Benedictins, to the wiſdom and ſanctity of their diſcipline, and to the miracles which were worked by their founder and his followers. But a more attentive view of things will convince the impartial obſerver, that the protection of the Roman pontifs, to the advancement of whoſe grandeur and authority the Benedictins were moſt ſervilely devoted, contributed much more to the luſtre and influence of their order, than any other circumſtances, nay, than all other conſiderations united together. But however univerſal their credit was, they did not reign alone; other orders ſubſiſted in ſeveral places until the ninth century, when the Benedictin abſorbed, indeed, all the other religious ſocieties, and held, unrivalled, the reins of the monaſtic empire [l].

The principal Greek and Oriental writers.

VIII. The moſt celebrated Greek and Oriental writers that flouriſhed in this century were thoſe which follow:

Procopius of *Gaza*, who interpreted ſucceſsfully ſeveral books of ſcripture [m].

Maxentius, a monk of *Antioch*, who, beſides ſeveral treatiſes againſt the ſects of his time, compoſed *Scholiums on* Dionysius *the Areopagite*.

Agapetus, whoſe *Scheda Regia*, addreſſed to the emperor Justinian, procured him a place among the wiſeſt and moſt judicious writers of this century.

Eulogius, a preſbyter of *Antioch*, who was the terror of heretics, and a warm and ſtrenuous defender of the orthodox faith.

John, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who, on account of his auſtere method of life, was ſurnamed the Faster, and who, acquired a certain degree of reputation by ſeveral little productions, and more particularly by his *Penitential*.

Leontius of *Byzantium*, whoſe book againſt the ſects, and other writings, are yet extant.

Evagrius, a ſcholaſtic writer, whoſe *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* is, in many places, corrupted with fabulous narrations.

Anastasius of *Sinai*, whom moſt writers conſider as the author of a trifling performance, written againſt a ſort of heretics called Acephali, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak afterwards [n].

Latin writers.

IX. Among the Latin writers the following are principally worthy of mention:

Gregory the Great, biſhop of *Rome*, who united the moſt inconſiſtent and contradictory qualities, as in ſome caſes he diſcovered a ſound and pene-

---

veter. as alſo his *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedict.* p. 29. This circumſtance, however, is denied by ſome writers; and among others, by Gallonius, concerning whoſe book, upon that ſubject, ſee Simon's *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iii. p. 63.

[k] Anton. Dadini Alteserræ, *Origines rei Monaſticæ*, lib. i. cap. ix. p. 33. The propagation of the Benedictine order, through the different provinces of Europe, is related by Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedictinum*, et *ad Sæc.* iv. p. I. p. 62.

[l] Lenfant, *Hiſtoire du Concile de Conſtance*, tom. ii. p. 32, 33.

[m] See Simon, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M.* Du Pin, tom. i. p. 197.

[n] See, for an account of this book, Simon, l. c. tom. i. p. 232; as alſo Barat. *Bibliotheque Choiſie*, tom. ii. p. 21.

trating judgment, and in others the moſt ſhameful and ſuperſtitious weakneſs; and in general manifeſted an extreme averſion to all kinds of learning, as his *Epiſtles* and *Dialogues* ſufficiently teſtify [o].

CÆSARIUS of *Arles*, who compoſed ſome moral writings, and drew up a *rule* of conduct and diſcipline for the *Holy Virgins* [p].

FULGENTIUS biſhop of *Ruſpina*, who attacked, with great warmth, the Arians and Pelagians in *Africa*; but whoſe ſtyle and manner were harſh and uncouth, as was generally the caſe of the African writers [q].

ENNODIUS biſhop of *Ticinum*, now *Pavia*, who was none of the meaneſt authors of this century, whether we conſider his compoſitions in proſe or in verſe; though he diſgraced his talents and diſhonoured his eloquence by his infamous adulation of the Roman pontif, whom he exalted ſo high above all mortals, as to maintain, that he was anſwerable to none upon earth for his conduct, and ſubject to no human tribunal [r].

BENEDICT of *Nurſia*, who acquired an immortal name, by the *rule* he laid down for the order which he inſtituted, and the multitude of religious ſocieties that ſubmitted to his diſcipline.

DIONYSIUS, who was ſurnamed the LITTLE, on account of his extraordinary humility, and was deſervedly eſteemed for his *Collection of the ancient canons*, and alſo for his *Chronological Reſearches*.

FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS, an African, who acquired a conſiderable degree of reputation by ſeveral treatiſes, but eſpecially by his *Abridgment of the canons*; though his ſtyle and diction were entirely deſtitute of harmony and elegance.

FACUNDUS, a ſtrenuous defender of the *Three Chapters*, of which we ſhall give an account in their place.

ARATOR, who tranſlated, with tolerable ſucceſs, *The acts of the Apoſtles*, into Latin verſe.

PRIMASIUS of *Adrumetum*, whoſe *Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, as alſo his book *Concerning hereſies*, are yet extant.

LIBERATUS, whoſe *Compendious hiſtory of the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies*, intitle him to an eminent rank among the writers of this century.

FORTUNATUS, a man of various erudition, and whoſe poetic compoſitions are far from being deſtitute of genius [s].

GREGORY of *Tours*, who is eſteemed the father of Gallic hiſtory; and who would have deſcended with honour to poſterity, did not his *Annals of the Francs*, and the reſt of his writings, carry ſo many marks of levity, credulity, and weakneſs [t].

---

[o] A ſplendid edition of the works of GREGORY was publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1705, in four volumes folio, by father St MARTHE, a Benedictine monk. See an account of this pontif, *Acta Sanctor*. tom. ii. Martii, p. 121.

[p] Of this writer, the Benedictine monks have given a learned account in their *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iii. p. 190.

[q] See, for an account of FULGENTIUS, the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Januar. p. 32, &c.

[r] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 96.

[s] Ibid. tom. iii. p. 464.

[t] The life of GREGORY of *Tours*, is to be found in the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*;

GILDAS, the moſt ancient of the Britiſh writers, who compoſed a book *Concerning the deſtruction of Britain*, in which there are ſeveral things not altogether unworthy of the curioſity of the learned.

COLUMBANUS, a native of *Ireland*, who became famous on account of the monaſtic rules he preſcribed to his followers, his zeal for eſtabliſhing religious orders, and his poetical productions [*u*].

ISIDORE biſhop of *Seville*, whoſe grammatical, theological, and hiſtorical productions diſcover more learning and pedantry, than judgment and taſte.

We may conclude this enumeration of the Latin writers with the illuſtrious names of BOETHIUS and CASSIODORUS, who far ſurpaſſed all their cotemporaries in learning and knowledge; the former ſhone forth with the brighteſt luſtre in the republic of letters as a philoſopher, an orator, a poet, and a divine, and both in elegance and ſubtilty of genius had no ſuperior, nor indeed any equal in this century; the latter, though in many reſpects inferior to him, was, nevertheleſs, far from being deſtitute of merit [*w*]. Several productions of theſe writers have been tranſmitted down to our times.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

The increaſe of ſuperſtition.

I. WHEN once the miniſters of the church had departed from the ancient ſimplicity of religious worſhip, and ſullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to ſet bounds to this growing corruption. Abuſes were daily multiplied, and ſuperſtition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of abſurdities, which were added to the doctrine of CHRIST and his apoſtles. The controverſial writers in the eaſtern provinces continued to render perplexed and obſcure ſome of the principal doctrines of Chriſtianity, by the ſubtile diſtinctions which they borrowed from a vain and chimerical philoſophy. The public teachers and inſtructors of the people degenerated ſadly from the apoſtolic character. They ſeemed to aim at nothing elſe, than to ſink the multitude into the moſt opprobrious ignorance and ſuperſtition; to efface in their minds all ſenſe of the beauty and excellence of genuine piety; and to ſubſtitute, in the place of religious principles, a blind veneration for the clergy, and a ſtupid zeal for a ſenſeleſs round of ridiculous rites and ceremonies. This, perhaps, will appear leſs ſurprizing, when we conſider, that *the blind led the blind*; for the public miniſters and teachers of religion were, for the moſt part, groſly ignorant; nay, almoſt as much ſo as the multitude whom they were appointed to inſtruct.

---

and his faults are mentioned by PAGI, in his *Diſſert. de Dionyſio Pariſ.* § 25. p. 16. which is added to the fourth tome of the *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* LAUNOIUS defends this hiſtorian in many things in his works, tom. i. part. II. p. 131.

[*u*] None have given more accurate accounts of GILDAS and COLUMBAN than the learned Benedictins, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 279. 505.

[*w*] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 211.

Proved by examples.

II. To be convinced of the truth of the diſmal repreſentation we have here given of the ſtate of religion at this time, nothing more is neceſſary than to caſt an eye upon the doctrines now taught *Concerning the worſhip of images and ſaints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good works*, i. e. the obſervance of human rites and inſtitutions, *towards the attainment of ſalvation, the power of relicks to heal the diſeaſes of body and mind*; and ſuch like ſordid and miſerable fancies, which are inculcated in many of the ſuperſtitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epiſtles and other writings of GREGORY the GREAT. Nothing more ridiculous on the one hand, than the ſolemnity and liberality with which this good, but ſilly, pontif diſtributed the wonder-working relicks; and nothing more lamentable on the other, than the ſtupid eagerneſs and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them; and ſuffered themſelves to be perſuaded, that a portion of ſtinking oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a ſupernatural efficacy to ſanctify its poſſeſſors, and to defend them from all dangers both of a temporal and ſpiritual nature [x].

The ſtate of exegetical or explanatory theology.

III. Several attempts were made in this century to lay down a proper and judicious method of explaining the ſcriptures. Of this nature were the two books of JUNILIUS the African, *Concerning the various parts of the divine law* [y]; a work deſtitute of preciſion and method; and by which it appears, that the author had not ſufficient knowledge and penetration for the taſk he undertook.

CASSIODORUS alſo, in his two books *Concerning the divine laws*, has delivered ſeveral rules for the right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

PHILOXENUS the Syrian tranſlated, into his native language, the *Pſalms of David*, and the *Books of the New Teſtament* [z].

The number of interpreters was conſiderable in this century. Thoſe, who made the greateſt figure among the Greeks in this character, were PROCOPIUS of *Gaza*, SEVERUS of *Antioch*, JULIAN, and a few others; the firſt was an expoſitor of no mean abilities [a]. The moſt eminent rank among the Latin commentators is due to GREGORY the GREAT, CASSIODORUS, PRIMASIUS [b], ISIDORE of *Seville* [c], and BELLATOR.

The defects of theſe expoſitors.

IV. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that theſe writers ſcarcely deſerve the name of expoſitors, if we except a ſmall number of them; and, among theſe, the eaſtern Neſtorians, who, following the example of THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, were careful in exploring the true ſenſe and the native energy of the words employed in the Holy Scriptures. So that we may divide the commentators of this age into two claſſes. In the *firſt*, we rank thoſe who did nothing more than collect the opinions and interpretations which had been received by the ancient doctors of the church; which collections were afterwards called *chains* by the Latins [d]. Such was the *chain of* Olympiodorus *on* Job; the *chain of* Victor *of* Capua *upon the Four Goſpels*; and the *commentary of* Primasius *on the Epiſtle to the Romans*, which was compiled from the works of Augustin, Jerom, Ambrose, and others. Even Procopius of *Gaza* may be ranked in this claſs, though not with ſo much reaſon as the mere compilers now mentioned; ſince, in many caſes, he has followed the dictates of his own judgment, and not followed, with a ſervile and implicit ſubmiſſion, the voice of antiquity. To the *ſecond* claſs belong thoſe fanciful expoſitors, who, ſetting up Origen as their great model, neglect and overlook entirely the ſenſe of the words employed by the ſacred writers, loſe themſelves in ſpiritual refinements and allegorical digreſſions, and, by the ſuccour of a lively and luxuriant imagination, draw from the ſcriptures arguments in favour of every whim they have thought proper to adopt. Such was Anastasius the Sinaite, whoſe *Myſterious contemplations upon the ſix days creation* [e], betray the levity and ignorance of their author; and Gregory the Great, whoſe *Moral obſervations upon the book of* Job, have formerly met with unmerited commendations. Such alſo were Isidore of *Seville*, and Primasius, as manifeſtly appears by the *Book of allegories upon the Holy Scriptures* [f], which was invented by the former; and the *Myſtical expoſition of the book of the Revelation* [g], which was imagined by the latter.

---

[x] See the *Liſt of ſacred oils, which* GREGORY *the* GREAT *ſent to queen* THEUDELINDA, in the work of RUINARTUS, intitled, *Acta Martyrum ſincera et ſelecta*, p. 619.

[y] See SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 229.

[z] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANUS, *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 83.

[a] See SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iv. p. 120. of the new edition.

[b] SIMON, *Hiſt. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* ch. xxiv. p. 337; as alſo his *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccl. de* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 226.

[c] SIMON, *Critique de la, &c. de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 259.

The methods of explaining the Chriſtian doctrine which now prevailed.

V. It would be needleſs to expect, from the divines of this century, an accurate view, or a clear and natural explanation, of the Chriſtian doctrine. The greateſt part of them reaſoned and diſputed concerning the truths of the goſpel, as the blind would argue about light and colours; and imagined that they had acquitted themſelves nobly, when they had thrown out a heap of crude and indigeſted notions, and overwhelmed their adverſaries with a torrent of words.

We may perceive, however, in the writers of this age, ſome evident marks of the three different methods of explaining and inculcating the doctrines of religion, which are yet practiſed among the Greeks and Latins. For ſome collected together a heap, rather than a ſyſtem of theological opinions, from the writings of the ancient doctors, from the decrees of councils, and from the holy Scriptures; ſuch were Isidore of *Seville* among the Latins, whoſe *three books of ſentences*, or *opinions*, are ſtill extant; and Leontius the Cyprian, among the Greeks, whoſe *Loci communes*, or *Common-place-book of divinity*, which he had compiled from the writings of the ancients, have been much eſteemed. Theſe authors gave riſe to that ſpecies of divinity, which the Latins diſtinguiſhed afterwards by the name of *poſitive theology*.

Others endeavoured to explain the various doctrines of Chriſtianity by reaſoning upon their nature, their excellence, and fitneſs; and thus it was, even with the weapons of *reaſon* and *argument*, that the moſt of the Chriſtian doctors diſputed againſt the Neſtorians, the Eutychians, and the Pelagians. Theſe metaphyſical divines were called *ſchoolmen*, and their writings were afterwards characteriſed under the general term of *ſcholaſtic divinity*.

---

[d] See Steph. Le Moyne, *Prolegomena ad varia Sacra*, p. 53. Jo. Albert. Fabricii *Biblioth. Græcæ*, lib. v. cap. xvii. or vol. vii. p. 727.

[e] The title is *Contemplationes Anagogicæ in Hexaëmeron*.

[f] *Liber Allegoriarum in Scripturam Sacram.*

[g] *Expoſitio Myſtica in Apocalypſin.*

A third claſs of theological teachers, very different from thoſe already mentioned, comprehended a certain ſpecies of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was only to be derived from inward feeling and mental contemplation. This claſs aſſumed the appellation of myſtics. Theſe three methods of deducing and unfolding the doctrines of the goſpel have been tranſmitted down to our times. No writer of this century compoſed a judicious or complete ſyſtem of divinity; though ſeveral branches of that ſacred ſcience were occaſionally illuſtrated.

The ſtate of practical religion and virtue.

VI. Thoſe who conſecrated their pious labours to the advancement of practical religion and moral virtue, aimed at the fulfilling this good purpoſe, partly by laying down *precepts*, and partly by exhibiting edifying *examples*. They who promoted the cauſe of piety and virtue in the former way, modified their *precepts* according to the ſtate and circumſtances of the perſons for whom they were deſigned. One ſort of precepts were addreſſed to thoſe who had not abandoned the connexions of civil ſociety, but lived amidſt the hurry of worldly affairs. A different ſet of rules was adminiſtered to thoſe who aſpired after higher degrees of perfection, and lived in a retirement from the contagion and vanities of the world. The *precepts*, addreſſed to the former, repreſent the Chriſtian life, as conſiſting in certain external virtues, and acts of religion; as appears from the *Homilies* and *Exhortations* of CÆSARIUS; the *Capita Parænetica* of AGAPETUS; and eſpecially from the *Formula honeſtæ vitæ*, i. e. the *Summary of a virtuous life*, drawn up by MARTIN, archbiſhop of *Braga* [*b*]. The rules adminiſtred to the latter ſort of Chriſtians, were more ſpiritual and ſublime: they were exhorted to ſeparate, as far as was poſſible, the ſoul from the body by divine contemplation; and for that purpoſe, to enervate and emaciate the latter by watching, faſting, perpetual prayer, and ſinging of pſalms; as we find in the Diſſertation of FULGENTIUS, *upon faſting*, and thoſe of NICETIUS, *Concerning the vigils of the ſervants of God*, and *the good effects of pſalmody*. The Greeks adopted for their leader, in this myſtic labyrinth, DIONYSIUS, falſly called the Areopagite, whoſe pretended writings, JOHN of *Scythopolis* illuſtrated with annotations in this century. We need not be at any pains in pointing out the defects of theſe injudicious zealots; the ſmalleſt acquaintance with that rational religion, which is contained in the goſpel, will be ſufficient to open the eyes of the impartial upon the abſurdities of that chimerical devotion we have now been deſcribing.

The lives of the ſaints.

VII. They who enforced the duties of Chriſtianity, by exhibiting *examples* of piety and virtue to the view of thoſe for whom their inſtructions were deſigned, wrote, for this purpoſe, the *Lives of the ſaints*; and there was a conſiderable number of this kind of biographers both among the Greeks and Latins. ENNODIUS, EUGIPPIUS, CYRIL of *Scythopolis*, DIONYSIUS the little, COGITOSUS, and others, are to be ranked in this claſs. But, however pious

---

[b] See the *Acta Sanctor. Martii*, tom. iii. p. 86.

the intention of theſe biographers may have been, it muſt be acknowledged, that they executed it in a moſt contemptible manner. No models of rational piety are to be found among thoſe pretended worthies, whom they propoſe to Chriſtians as objects of imitation. They amuſe their readers with gigantic fables and trifling romances; the examples they exhibit are thoſe of certain delirious *fanatics*, whom they call *ſaints*; men of a corrupt and perverted judgment, who offered violence to reaſon and nature by the horrors of an extravagant auſterity in their own conduct, and by the ſeverity of thoſe ſingular and inhuman rules which they preſcribed to others. For, by what means were theſe men *ſainted?* By ſtarving themſelves with a frantic obſtinacy, and bearing the uſeleſs hardſhips of hunger, thirſt, and inclement ſeaſons with ſtedfaſtneſs and perſeverance; by running about the country like madmen in tattered garments and ſometimes half-naked, or ſhutting themſelves up in a narrow ſpace, where they continued motionleſs; by ſtanding for a long time in certain poſtures, with their eyes cloſed in the enthuſiaſtic expectation of divine light. All this was ſaint-like and glorious; and the more that any ambitious fanatic departed from the dictates of reaſon and common ſenſe, and counterfeited the wild geſtures and the incoherent conduct of an ideot, or a lunatic, the ſurer was his proſpect of obtaining an eminent rank among the heros and demi-gods of a corrupt and degenerate church.

Polemic divinity.

VIII. Many writers laboured with diligence to terminate the reigning controverſies, but none with ſucceſs. Nor ſhall we be much ſurprized, that theſe efforts were ineffectual, when we conſider how they were conducted; for ſcarcely can we name a ſingle writer, whoſe oppoſition to the Eutychians, Neſtorians, and Pelagians was carried on with probity, moderation, or prudence. PRIMASIUS and PHILOPONUS wrote concerning all the ſects, but their works are loſt; the treatiſe of LEONTIUS, upon the ſame extenſive ſubject, is ſtill extant, but is ſcarcely worth peruſing. ISIDORE of *Seville*, and LEONTIUS of *Neapolis*, diſputed againſt the Jews, but with what ſucceſs and dexterity will be eaſily imagined by thoſe who are acquainted with the learning and logic of theſe times. We omit, therefore, any further mention of the miſerable diſputants of this century, from a perſuaſion that it will be more uſeful and entertaining to lay before the reader a brief account of the controverſies that now divided and troubled the Chriſtian church.

The controverſies, concerning Origen and his doctrine, renewed.

IX. Though the credit of ORIGEN, and his ſyſtem, ſeemed to lie expiring under the blows it had received from the zeal of the orthodox, and the repeated thunder of ſynods and councils, yet it was very far from being totally ſunk. On the contrary, this great man, and his doctrine, were held by many, and eſpecially by the monks, in the higheſt veneration; and cheriſhed with a kind of enthuſiaſm which became boundleſs and extravagant. In the weſt, BELLATOR tranſlated the works of ORIGEN into the Latin language. In the eaſtern provinces, and particularly in *Syria* and *Paleſtine*, which were the principal ſeats of Origeniſm, the monks, ſeconded by ſeveral biſhops, and chiefly by THEODORE of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, defended the truth and authority of the doctrines of ORIGEN againſt all his adverſaries with incredible vehemence and contention of mind [*i*]. The cauſe was, at length, brought before JUSTINIAN, who, in a long and verboſe edict, addreſſed to MENNAS patriarch of *Conſtantinople* [*k*], paſſed a ſevere condemnation upon ORIGEN and his doctrine, and ordered it to be entirely ſuppreſſed [*l*]. The effects of this edict were more violent than durable; for, upon the breaking out of the controverſy concerning the *three chapters* [*m*], ſoon after this time, Origeniſm was not only revived in *Paleſtine*, but even recovered new vigour, and ſpred itſelf far and wide. Hence many commotions were raiſed in the church, which were, however, terminated by the fifth general council, aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* by JUSTINIAN, A. D. 553, and in which ORIGEN and his followers were again condemned [*n*].

The controverſy concerning the three chapters.

X. This controverſy produced another which continued much longer, was carried on with ſtill more exceſſive degrees of animoſity and violence, and the ſubject of which was of much leſs moment and importance. The emperor JUSTINIAN was eagerly bent upon extirpating that violent branch of the Monophyſites, who were diſtinguiſhed by the name of Acephali; and conſulted, upon this matter, THEODORE biſhop of *Cæſarea*, who was a Monophyſite, and, at the ſame time, extremely attached to the doctrine of ORIGEN. The artful prelate conſidered this as a favourable opportunity of procuring repoſe to the followers of ORIGEN by exciting a new controverſy; as alſo of caſting a reproach upon the council of *Chalcedon*, and giving a mortal blow to the Neſtorians and their cauſe. In order, therefore, to effect theſe three important purpoſes, he perſuaded the emperor that the Acephali would return to the boſom of the church, under the following eaſy and reaſonable conditions; namely, "That thoſe paſſages in the acts of the council of *Chalcedon*, "in which THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*, THEODORET of *Cyrus*, and IBAS of "*Edeſſa*, had been pronounced orthodox, ſhould be effaced; and that the "productions of theſe prelates, which were known by the appellation of the "*three chapters* [*o*], as alſo other writings of theirs, which diſcovered a mani-

---

[*i*] CYRILLUS, *Scythopolis, in vita Sabæ*, which is to be found in COTELERIUS, *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Cræcæ*, p. 370. HENR. NORIS, *Diſſertat. de Synodo quinta*, cap. i, ii. p. 554. tom. i. Opp.

[*k*] This edict is publiſhed in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 243.

[(*l*) This edict was procured by the ſolicitation of PELAGIUS, who was legate of VIGILIUS, at the court of *Conſtantinople*, with a view to confound the Acephali, who were admirers of ORIGEN, and particularly to vex THEODORE, of whoſe credit with the emperor, PELAGIUS was extremely jealous. It was to return this affront, as well as to effect the purpoſes mentioned in the following ſection, that THEODORE ſet on foot the controverſy concerning the *three chapters*, which produced ſuch tedious, cruel, and fatal diſſenſions in the church. See BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, livr. x. ch. vi. p. 520.]

[*m*] For an explication of what is meant by the *three chapters*, ſee note [*o*] of the X^th^ ſection.

[*n*] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 283. EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. BASNAGE, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, livr. x. ch. vi. p. 517, &c. PET. DAN. HUETII *Origeniana*, lib. ii. 224. DOUCIN's *Singular. Diſſ.* which is ſubjoined to his *Hiſtoria Origeniana*, p. 345.

[(*o*) The pieces, that were diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of the *three chapters*, were 1. The writings of THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia*. 2. The books which THEODORET of *Cyrus* wrote againſt the *twelve Anathemas*, which CYRIL had publiſhed againſt the Neſtorians. 3. The letter which IBAS of *Edeſſa* had written to one MARIS a Perſian, concerning the council of *Epheſus* and the condemnation of NESTORIUS. Theſe writings were ſuppoſed to favour the

" ſect

" feſt propenſity towards the Neſtorian errors, ſhould be condemned and pro-" hibited." The emperor lent a propitious ear to the counſels of this prelate; and, by an edict publiſhed A. D. 544, ordered the *three chapters* to be condemned and effaced, without any prejudice, however, to the authority of the council of *Chalcedon* [*p*]. This edict was warmly oppoſed by the African and weſtern biſhops, and particularly by VIGILIUS, the Roman pontif, who conſidered it as highly injurious not only to the authority of the council now mentioned, but alſo to the memory of thoſe holy men whoſe writings and characters it covered with reproach [*q*]. Upon this, JUSTINIAN ordered VIGILIUS to repair immediately to *Conſtantinople*, that, having him in his power, he might compel him with more facility to acquieſce in the edict, and reject the *three chapters*; and this method was attended with ſucceſs, for the pontif yielded. On the other hand, the biſhops of *Africa* and *Illyricum* obliged VIGILIUS to retract his *judicatum*, by which, in a council of ſeventy biſhops, he had condemned the *three chapters* in obedience to the emperor. For they ſeparated themſelves from the communion of this pope, and refuſed to acknowledge him as one of their brethren; nay, treated him as an apoſtate, until he approved what he had been obliged to condemn. The effect of this retractation redoubled the zeal and violence of JUSTINIAN, who, by a ſecond edict, publiſhed A. D. 551, condemned anew the *three chapters*.

The œcumenical council.

XI. After many cabals, commotions, and diſſenſions, which were occaſioned by this trifling controverſy, it was thought proper to ſubmit the final deciſion of it to an aſſembly of the univerſal church. This aſſembly was accordingly ſummoned, by JUSTINIAN, to meet at *Canſtantinople* A. D. 553, and is conſidered as the *fifth œcumenical*, or *general council*. The emperor gained his point here: for, beſides the doctrines of ORIGEN [*r*], the *three chapters*, the condemnation of which he had ſolely in view, were, by the biſhops of the eaſt (for there were very few weſtern prelates preſent at this council) declared heretical and pernicious. VIGILIUS, who was now at *Conſtantinople*, refuſed his aſſent to the decrees of this council; for which reaſon, after having received various affronts, he was ſent into exile, from whence he was not per-

---

Neſtorian doctrine, and ſuch, indeed, was their tendency. It is, however, to be obſerved, that THEODORE of *Mopſueſtia* lived before the time of NESTORIUS, and died not only in the communion of the church, but alſo in the higheſt reputation for his ſanctity. Nor were the writings of the other two either condemned or cenſured by the council of *Chalcedon*; nay, the faith of THEODORET and IBAS were there declared entirely orthodox. The deciſion of the council of *Conſtantinople*, in oppoſition to this, ſhews that councils, as well as doctors, differ.]

[*p*] See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 287. EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. p. 412.

[*q*] HEN. NORIS, *De ſynodo quinta*, cap. x. p. 579. tom. i. Opp. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. livr. x. cap. vi. p. 523.

[(*r*) We do not find in the *acts* of this council any one which condemns the doctrines of ORIGEN. It is, however, generally imagined, that theſe doctrines were condemned by this aſſembly; and what gave riſe to this notion was probably the xv Greek canons yet extant, in which the principal errors of ORIGEN are condemned, and which are intitled the canons of the 160 fathers aſſembled in the council of *Conſtantinople*. The tenets of ORIGEN, which gave the moſt offence, were the following: 1. That, in the trinity, the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, and the *Son* than the Holy Ghoſt. 2. The *pre-exiſtence* of ſouls, which ORIGEN conſidered as ſent into mortal bodies for the puniſhment of ſins committed in a former ſtate of being. 3.

mitted to return before he had acquieſced in the deciſions of this aſſembly [s]; and, changing his ſentiments for the fourth time, had declared the opinions contained in the *three chapters* to be execrable blaſphemies. His ſucceſſor PELAGIUS, and all the Roman pontifs that have ſince lolled in the papal chair, adhered to the decrees of this council; but neither their authority, nor that of the emperor, could prevail upon the weſtern biſhops to follow their example in this reſpect. Many of theſe, on the contrary, carried matters ſo far as to ſeparate themſelves from the communion of the pope on this account; and the diviſions, that aroſe from hence in the church, were too violent to admit of an expeditious or eaſy reconciliation, and could only be healed by length of time [t].

The queſtion, whether one of the trinity may be ſaid to have ſuffered? debated.

XII. Another controverſy of much more importance had been carried on before this period among the Greeks; it was firſt kindled in the year 519, and it aroſe upon the following queſtion: *Whether it could be ſaid, with propriety, that* ONE OF THE TRINITY *ſuffered on the croſs?* This was deſigned to embarraſs the Neſtorians, who ſeemed to ſeparate too much the two natures in CHRIST; and the Scythian monks, who ſeconded this deſign, and to whom the riſe of this controverſy is principally to be imputed, maintained the affirmative of this nice and difficult queſtion. Others aſſerted, on the contrary, that this manner of ſpeaking was by no means to be adopted, ſince it bordered upon the erroneous expreſſions and tenets of the Theopaſchites, who compoſed one of the ſects into which the Eutychians were ſubdivided [u]. This latter opinion was confirmed by HORMISDAS the Roman pontif, to whom the Scythian monks had appealed in vain; but this, inſtead of allaying the heat of the preſent controverſy, only added new fuel to the flame. JOHN II, who was one of the ſucceſſors of HORMISDAS, approved the propoſition which the latter had condemned; and, confirming the opinion of the Scythian monks, expoſed the deciſions of the papal oracle to the laughter of the wiſe; his ſentence was afterwards approved by the fifth general council; and thus peace was reſtored in the church by the concluſion of theſe unintelligible diſputes [w].

That the *ſoul* of CHRIST was united to the *word* before the incarnation. 4. That the ſun, moon, and ſtars, *&c.* were animated and endowed with rational ſouls. 5. That after the reſurrection all bodies will be of a round figure. 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that as CHRIST had been crucified in this world to ſave mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to ſave the devils.]

[s] See PETR. DE MARCA, *Diſſert. de decreto Vigilii pro confirmatione Synodi* V, which is to be found among the *Diſſertations* ſubjoined to his learned work, *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii.*

[t] The beſt account of this matter is to be found in NORIS, *De ſynodo quinta œcumenica,* though even this excellent author cannot be vindicated from the imputation of a certain degree of partiality. See alſo CHRIST. LUPUS, *Not. ad concilium quintum,* in his *Ad concilia Adnotat.*

[(u) The deacon VICTOR, and thoſe who oppoſed the Scythian monks, expreſſed their opinion in the following propoſition: viz. *One* PERSON *of the Trinity ſuffered in the fleſh.* Both ſides received the council of *Chalcedon,* acknowledged *two natures* in CHRIST, in oppoſition to EUTYCHES; and only *one perſon,* in oppoſition to NESTORIUS; and yet by a torrent of jargon, and a long chain of unintelligible Syllogiſms, the Scythian monks accuſed their adverſaries of Neſtorianiſm, and were accuſed by them of the Eutychian hereſy.]

[w] See NORISII *Hiſtoria controverſiæ de uno ex Trinitate paſſo,* tom. iii. Opp. p. 771. The ancient writers, who mention this controverſy, call the monks, who ſet it on foot, Scythians.

With the queſtion now mentioned, there was another cloſely and intimately connected, namely, *Whether the* PERSON *of* CHRIST *could be conſidered as* COMPOUNDED? Of this queſtion the Scythian monks maintained the affirmative, and their adverſaries the negative.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

I. IN this century the cauſe of true religion ſunk apace, and the gloomy reign of ſuperſtition extended itſelf in proportion to the decay of genuine piety. This lamentable decay was ſupplied by a multitude of rites and ceremonies. In the eaſt the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies gave occaſion to the invention of various rites and external inſtitutions, which were uſed as marks to diſtinguiſh from each other the contending parties. The weſtern churches were loaded with rites by GREGORY the GREAT, who had a marvellous fecundity of genius in inventing, and an irreſiſtible force of eloquence in recommending ſuperſtitious obſervances. Nor will this appear ſurprizing to thoſe who know, that, in the opinion of this pontif, the *words* of the ſacred writings were *images* of myſterious and inviſible things; for ſuch as embrace this chimerical ſyſtem, will eaſily be led to expreſs all the doctrines and precepts of religion by external rites and ſymbols. GREGORY, indeed, is worthy of praiſe in this, that he did not pretend to force others to the obſervance of his inventions; though this, perhaps, was as much owing to a want of power, as to a principle of moderation.

The occaſions of them inveſtigated.

II. This prodigious augmentation of rites and ceremonies rendered an augmentation of doctors and interpreters of theſe myſteries indiſpenſably neceſſary. Hence a new kind of ſcience aroſe, which had, for its object, the explication of theſe ceremonies, and the inveſtigation of the cauſes and circumſtances from whence they derived their origin. But the moſt of thoſe, who entered into theſe reſearches, never went to the fountain-head to the true ſources of theſe idle inventions. They endeavoured to ſeek their origin in reaſon and Chriſtianity; but in this they deceived themſelves, or, at leaſt, deluded others, and delivered to the world their own fancies, inſtead of letting them into the true cauſes of things. Had they been acquainted with the opinions and cuſtoms of remote antiquity, or ſtudied the pontifical law of the Greeks and Romans, they had come at the true origin of many inſtitutions, which were falſely looked upon as venerable and ſacred.

Public worſhip.

III. The public worſhip of God was as yet celebrated by every nation in its own language; but was enlarged, from time to time, by the addition of various hymns, and other things of that nature, which were conſidered as proper to enliven devotion by the power of novelty. GREGORY the GREAT preſcribed a new method of adminiſtring the Lord's ſupper, with a magnificent

---

But LA CROZE, in his *Theſaur. Epiſt.* tom. iii. p. 189. imagines, that the country of theſe monks was *Egypt*, and not *Scythia*; and this conjecture is ſupported by reaſons which carry in them, at leaſt, a high degree of probability.

aſſemblage

The adminiſtration of the euchariſt.

aſſemblage of pompous ceremonies; this inſtitution of his was called the *canon of the maſs*; and, if any are unwilling to give it the name of a *new* appointment, they muſt, at leaſt, acknowledge that it was a conſiderable augmentation of the ancient canon for celebrating the euchariſt, and occaſioned a remarkable change in the adminiſtration of that ordinance. Many ages, however, paſſed before this *Gregorian canon* was adopted by all the Latin churches [x].

Baptiſm.

Baptiſm, except in caſes of neceſſity, was adminiſtred only on great feſtivals. We omit mentioning, for the ſake of brevity, the Litanies that were addreſſed to the ſaints, the different ſorts of ſupplications, the *ſtations*, or aſſemblies of GREGORY, the forms of conſecration, and other ſuch inſtitutions, which were contrived, in this century, to excite a ſpecies of external devotion, and to engage the outward ſenſes in religious worſhip. An enquiry into theſe matters would of itſelf deſerve to be made the ſubject of a ſeparate work.

IV. There was an incredible number of temples erected in honour of the ſaints, during this century both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. The places ſet apart for public worſhip were already very numerous; but it was now that Chriſtrians firſt began to conſider theſe ſacred edifices, as the means of purchaſing the favour and protection of the ſaints; and to be perſuaded that theſe departed ſpirits defended and guarded againſt evils and calamities of every kind, the provinces, lands, cities, and villages, in which they were honoured with temples. The number of theſe temples was almoſt equalled by that of the feſtivals, which were now obſerved in the Chriſtian church, and many of which ſeem to have been inſtituted upon a Pagan model. To thoſe that were celebrated in the preceding century, were now added the feſtival of the *purification of the Bleſſed Virgin*, invented with a deſign to remove the uneaſineſs of the heathen converts on account of the loſs of their *lupercalia*, or feaſts of pan, which had been formerly obſerved in the month of February, the feſtival of the *immaculate conception*, the day ſet apart to commemorate the birth of St. JOHN, and others leſs worthy of mention.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

The remains of the ancient hereſies.

I. THE various ſects, which had fomented diviſions among Chriſtians in the early ages of the church, were far from being effectually ſuppreſſed, or totally extirpated. Though they had been perſecuted and afflicted with an infinite diverſity of trials and calamities, yet they ſtill ſubſiſted and continued to excite diſſenſions and tumults in many places.

Manicheans.

The Manicheans are ſaid to have gained ſuch a degree of influence among the Perſians, as to have corrupted even the ſon of CABADES, the monarch of that nation, who repaid their zeal in making proſelytes with a terrible maſſacre, in which numbers of that impious ſect periſhed in the moſt dreadful manner. Nor was *Perſia* the only country, which was troubled with the attempts of the Manichæans to ſpred their odious doctrine; other provinces of the empire were, undoubtedly, infected with their errors, as we may judge from the book that was written againſt them by HERACLIAN biſhop of *Chalcedon* [y]. In *Gaul* and *Africa*, diſſenſions of a different kind prevailed; and the controverſy between the Semi-pelagians and the diſciples of AUGUSTIN continued to divide the weſtern churches.

---

[x] See THEOD. CHR. LILIENTHAL, *De canone miſſæ Gregoriano.*

Semi-pelagians.

Donatiſts.

II. The Donatiſts enjoyed the ſweets of freedom and tranquillity, as long as the Vandals reigned in *Africa*; but the ſcene was greatly changed with reſpect to them, when the empire of theſe Barbarians was overturned in the year 534. They, however, ſtill remained in a ſeparate body, and not only held their church, but, towards the concluſion of this century, and particularly from the year 591, defended themſelves with new degrees of animoſity and vigour, and were bold enough to attempt the multiplication of their ſect. GREGORY, the Roman pontif, oppoſed theſe efforts with great ſpirit and aſſiduity; and, as appears from his epiſtles [z], tried various methods of depreſſing this faction, which was pluming its wings anew, and menacing the revival of thoſe lamentable diviſions which it had formerly excited in the church. Nor was the oppoſition of the zealous pontif without effect; it ſeems, on the contrary, to have been attended with the deſired ſucceſs, ſince, in this century, the church of the Donatiſts dwindled away to nothing, and after this period no traces of it are any where to be found.

Arians.

III. Towards the commencement of this century, the Arians were triumphant in ſeveral parts of *Aſia*, *Africa*, and *Europe*. Many of the Aſiatic biſhops favoured them ſecretly, while their opinions were openly profeſſed, and their cauſe maintained by the Vandals in *Africa*, the Goths in *Italy*, the Spaniards, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the greateſt part of the Gauls. It is true, the Greeks, who had received the decrees of the council of *Nice*, perſecuted and oppreſſed the Arians wherever their influence and authority could reach; but the Nicenians, in their turn, were not leſs rigourouſly treated by their adverſaries, particularly in *Africa* and *Italy*, where they felt, in a very ſevere manner, the weight of the Arian power, and the bitterneſs of their reſentment [a].

The triumphs of Arianiſm were, however, but tranſitory; and its proſperous days were entirely eclipſed, when the Vandals were driven out of *Africa*, and the Goths out of *Italy*, by the arms of JUSTINIAN [b]. For the other Arian princes were eaſily induced to abandon, themſelves, the doctrine of that ſect; and not only ſo, but to employ the force of laws and the authority of councils to prevent its further progreſs among their ſubjects, and to extirpate it entirely out of their dominions. Such was the conduct of Sigismund king of the Burgundians; Theodimir king of the Suevi, who had ſettled in *Luſitania*; and Reccared king of *Spain*. Whether the change wrought in theſe princes was owing to the force of reaſon and argument, or to the influence of hopes and fears, is a queſtion which we ſhall not pretend to determine. One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that, from this period, the Arian ſect declined apace, and could never after recover any conſiderable degree of ſtability and conſiſtence.

---

[y] See PHOTIUS, *Biblioth. Cod.* cxiv. p. 291.

[z] See his *Epiſtles*, lib. iv. *ep.* xxxiv, xxxv. p. 714, 715. lib. vi. *ep.* lxv. p. 841. *ep.* xxxvii. p. 821. lib. ix. *ep.* liii. p. 972. lib. ii. *ep.* xlviii. p. 611. tom. ii. Opp.

[a] PROCOPIUS, *De bello Vandal.* lib. i. cap. viii. and *De bello Gothico*, lib. ii. cap. ii. EVAGRIUS, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iv. cap. xv.

[b] See MASCOVII *Hiſtoria German.* tom. ii. p. 76. 91. See alſo an account of the Barbarian kings, who abandoned Arianiſm, and received the doctrines of the Nicene council, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii, p. 275, and April. p. 134.

The ſtate of the Neſtorians.

IV. The Neſtorians, after having gained a firm footing in *Perſia*, and eſtabliſhed the patriarch, or head, of their ſect at *Seleucia*, extended their views further, and ſpred their doctrines, with a ſucceſs equal to the ardour of their zeal, through the provinces that lay beyond the limits of the Roman empire. There are yet extant authentic records from which it appears, that, throughout all *Perſia*, as alſo in *India*, *Armenia*, *Arabia*, *Syria*, and other countries, there were vaſt numbers of Neſtorian churches, all under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Seleucia* [*c*]. It is true, indeed, that the Perſian monarchs were not all equally favourable to this growing ſect, and that ſome of them even perſecuted, with the utmoſt ſeverity, all thoſe who bore the Chriſtian name throughout their dominions [*d*]; but it is alſo true, that ſuch of theſe princes, as were diſpoſed to exerciſe moderation and benignity towards the Chriſtians, were much more indulgent to the Neſtorians, than to their adverſaries who adhered to the council of *Epheſus*; ſince the latter were conſidered as ſpies employed by the Greeks, with whom they were connected by the ties of religion.

Eutychian controverſies.

V. The Monophyſites, or Eutychians, flouriſhed alſo in this century, and had gained over to their doctrine a conſiderable part of the eaſtern provinces. The emperor Anastasius was warmly attached to the doctrine and ſect of the Acephali, who were reckoned among the more rigid Monophyſites [*e*]; and, in the year 513, created patriarch of *Antioch*, in the room of Flavian whom he had expelled from that ſee, Severus, a learned monk of *Paleſtine*, from whom the Monophyſites were called Severians [*f*]. This emperor exerted all his influence and authority to deſtroy the credit of the council of *Chalcedon* in the eaſt, and to maintain the cauſe of thoſe who adhered to the doctrine of *one nature* in Christ; and, by the ardour and vehemence of his zeal, he excited the moſt deplorable ſeditions and tumults in the church [*g*].

[*c*] Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographiæ Chriſtianæ* lib. ii. p. 125. which is to be found in Montfaucon's *Collectio nova PP. Græcorum.*

[*d*] Jos. Sim. Asseman. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom iii. part. I. p. 109. 407. 411. 441. 449. tom. iii. part. II. cap. v. § 2. p. 83.

[*e*] Evagrius, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iii. cap. xxx. xliv, &c. Theodorus the Reader, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. ii. p. 562. See alſo the *Index operum* Severi, as it ſtands collected from ancient MSS. in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 53.

[*f*] See Jos. Sim. Asseman. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 47. 321. Euseb. Renaudot, *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandrinor.* p. 127. 129. 130. 135. 138, &c.

[*g*] Evagrius, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. iii. cap. xxxiii. Cyrillus, *vita Sabæ in* Jo. Bapt. Coteleri *Monument. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 312. Bayle's *Dictionary*, at the article Anastasius.

After the death of ANASTASIUS, which happened A. D. 518, SEVERUS was expelled in his turn; and the ſect which the late emperor had maintained and propagated with ſuch zeal and aſſiduity, was every where oppoſed and depreſſed by his ſucceſſor JUSTIN, and the following emperors, in ſuch a manner, that it ſeemed to be upon the very brink of ruin, notwithſtanding that it had created SERGIUS patriarch in the place of SEVERUS [*b*].

Jacob Baradæus the reſtorer of the Monophyſites.

VI. When the affairs of the Monophyſites were in ſuch a deſperate ſituation, that almoſt all hope of their recovery was vaniſhed, and their biſhops were reduced, by death and impriſonment, to a very ſmall number, an obſcure man, whoſe name was JACOB, and who was diſtinguiſhed from others ſo called, by the ſurname of BARADÆUS, or ZANZALUS, reſtored this expiring ſect to its former proſperity and luſtre [*i*]. This poor monk, the grandeur of whoſe views was much above the obſcurity of his ſtation, and whoſe fortitude and patience no dangers could daunt, nor any labours exhauſt, was ordained to the epiſcopal office by a handful of captive biſhops, travelled on foot through the whole eaſt, eſtabliſhed biſhops and preſbyters every where, revived the drooping ſpirits of the Monophyſites, and produced ſuch an aſtoniſhing change in their affairs by the power of his eloquence, and, by his incredible activity and diligence, that when he died biſhop of *Edeſſa*, A. D. 588, he left his ſect in a moſt flouriſhing ſtate in *Syria*, *Meſopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Egypt*, *Nubia*, *Abyſſinia*, and other countries [*k*]. This dexterous monk had prudence to contrive the means of ſucceſs, as well as activity, to put them in execution; for he almoſt totally extinguiſhed all the animoſities, and reconciled all the factions that had divided the Monophyſites; and when their churches grew ſo numerous in the eaſt, that they could not all be conveniently comprehended under the ſole juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Antioch*, he appointed, as his aſſiſtant, the primate of the eaſt, whoſe reſidence was at *Tagritis*, on the borders of *Armenia* [*l*]. The laborious efforts of JACOB were ſeconded in *Egypt*, and the adjacent countries, by THEODOSIUS biſhop of *Alexandria*; and he became ſo famous, that all the Monophyſites of the eaſt conſidered him as their ſecond parent and founder, and are to this day called Jacobites in honour of their new chief.

The ſtate of the Monophyſites.

VII. Thus it happened, that, by the imprudent zeal and violence which the Greeks employed in defending the truth, the Monophyſites gained conſiderable advantages, and, at length, obtained a ſolid and permanent ſettlement. From this period their ſect has been under the juriſdiction of the patriarchs of

---

[*b*] See ABULPHARAII *Series Patriarch. Antiochen. in* ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* &c. tom. ii p. 323.

[*i*] See ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. cap. viii. p. 62. 72. 326. 331. 414. EUSEBII RENAUD. *Hiſt. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p 119. 133. 425, and the *Liturgiæ Orient.* tom. ii. p. 333. 342. FAUSTUS NAIRONUS, *Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum monumentis*, part. I. p. 40, 41.

[*k*] Concerning the Nubians and Abyſſinians, ſee ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* &c. tom. ii. p. 330. LOBO, *Voyage d'Abyſſinie*, tom. ii. p. 36. LUDOLPH. *Commentar. ad Hiſtoriam Æthiopicam*, p. 451. 461. 466.

[*l*] ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. 410. 414. 418. See alſo this learned writer's *Diſſertatio de Monophyſitis*, which is prefixed to the ſecond volume of the work now cited.

Alexandria and *Antioch*, who, notwithſtanding the difference of opinion which ſubſiſts, with reſpect to ſome points, between the Syrian and Egyptian Monophyſites, are extremely careful to maintain communion with each other both by letters and by the exchange of good offices. The primate of the Abyſſines is ſubject to the patriarch of *Alexandria*; and the primate of the eaſt, who reſides at *Tagritis*, is under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of *Antioch*. The Armenians are ruled by a biſhop of their own, and are diſtinguiſhed by certain opinions and rites from the reſt of the Monophyſites.

Controverſies among the Monophyſites.

VIII. The ſect of the Monophyſites, before it was thus happily eſtabliſhed, was torn with factions and inteſtine diſputes, and ſuffered, in a particular manner, from that nice and ſubtile controverſy concerning *the body of* CHRIST, which was kindled at *Alexandria*. JULIAN, biſhop of *Halicarnaſſus*, affirmed, A. D. 519, that the divine nature had ſo inſinuated itſelf into the body of CHRIST, from the very moment of the Virgin's conception, that the body of our Lord changed its nature, and became *incorruptible*. This opinion was alſo embraced by CAIANUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*: from whom thoſe who adopted it, were called Caianiſts. They were, however, divided into three ſects, two of which debated this queſtion, whether the body of CHRIST was *created* or *increated*? While the third aſſerted, that our Lord's body was indeed corruptible, but never actually corrupted, ſince the energy of the divine nature muſt have prevented its diſſolution.

This ſect was warmly oppoſed by SEVERUS of *Antioch*, and DAMIANUS, who maintained that the body of CHRIST, before his reſurrection, was truly *corruptible*, i. e. ſubject to the affections and changes with which human nature is generally attended. Thoſe who embraced the opinion of JULIAN, were called Aphthartodocetæ, Docetæ, Phantaſiaſts, and even Manicheans, becauſe it was ſuppoſed to follow from their hypotheſis, that CHRIST did not ſuffer in *reality*, but only in *appearance*, hunger and thirſt, pain and death, and that he did not actually aſſume the common affections and properties of human nature. On the other hand, the votaries of SEVERUS were diſtinguiſhed by the names Pthartolatræ, Ktiſtolatræ, and Creaticolæ. This miſerable controverſy was carried on with great warmth under the reign of JUSTINIAN, who favoured the Aphthartodocetæ; ſoon after it ſubſided gradually, and, at length, was happily huſhed in ſilence [m]. XENAIAS of *Hierapolis* ſtruck out an hypotheſis upon this knotty matter, which ſeemed equally remote from thoſe of the contending parties; for he maintained that CHRIST had, indeed, truly ſuffered the various ſenſations to which humanity is expoſed; but that he ſuffered them not in his *nature*, but by a ſubmiſſive act of his *will* [n].

The Agnoëtæ.

IX. Some of the Corrupticolæ (for ſo *they* were called who looked upon the body of CHRIST to be corruptible) particularly THEMISTIUS, a deacon of *Alexandria*, and THEODOSIUS, a biſhop of that city, were carried by the inconſiderate heat of controverſy into another opinion, which produced new commotions in the church towards the concluſion of this century. They affirmed, that to the divine nature of CHRIST all things were known; but that from his human nature many things were concealed. The reſt of the ſect charged the authors of this opinion with imputing ignorance to the divine nature of CHRIST; ſince they held in common, with them, that there was but one nature in the ſon of God. Hence the votaries of this new doctrine were called Agnoëtæ [o]; but their ſect was ſo weak and ill-ſupported, that, notwithſtanding their eloquence and activity, which ſeemed to promiſe better ſucceſs, it gradually declined, and came to nothing.

---

[m] TIMOTHEUS, *De receptione hæreticorum in* COTELERII *Monumentis Eccleſiaſt. Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409. LIBERATUS, *in Breviario controv.* cap. xx. FORBESII *Inſtructiones Hiſtorico-Theologicæ*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. p. 108. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Oriental.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 457.

[n] ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 22. and 168.

The Tritheiſts.

X. From the controverſies with the Monophyſites aroſe the ſect of the Tritheiſts, whoſe chief was JOHN ASCUSNAGE, a Syrian philoſopher, and, at the ſame time, a Monophyſite [p]. This man imagined in the deity three natures, or ſubſtances, abſolutely equal in all reſpects, and joined together by no common *eſſence*; to which opinion his adverſaries gave the name of Tritheiſm. One of the warmeſt defenders of this doctrine was JOHN PHILOPONUS, an Alexandrian philoſopher and grammarian of the higheſt reputation; and hence he has been conſidered by many as the author of this ſect, whoſe members have conſequently derived from him the title of Philoponiſts [q].

This ſect was divided into two parties, the Philoponiſts and the Cononites; the latter of whom were ſo called from CONON biſhop of *Tarſus*, their chief [r]. They agreed in the doctrine of *three perſons* in the Godhead, and differed only in their manner of explaining what the ſcriptures taught concerning the reſurrection of the body. PHILOPONUS maintained that the *form*, as well as the *matter*, of all bodies was *generated* and *corrupted*, and that both, therefore, were to be reſtored in the reſurrection. CONON held, on the contrary, that the body never loſt its *form*; that its *matter* alone was ſubject to corruption and decay, and was conſequently to be reſtored when *this mortal ſhall put on immortality*.

A third faction was that of the DAMIANISTS, who were ſo called from DAMIAN biſhop of *Alexandria*, and whoſe opinion concerning the trinity was different from thoſe already mentioned. They diſtinguiſhed the *divine eſſence* from the *three perſons*, viz. the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. They denied that each perſon was God, when conſidered in itſelf and abſtractedly from the other two; but they affirmed, at the ſame time, that there was a *common divinity* by the joint participation of which each perſon was God. They therefore called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, hypoſtaſes, or perſons, and the *Godhead*, which was common to them all, *ſubſtance* or *nature* [s].

---

[o] JO. BAPT. COTELERIUS, *Ad monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 641. MICH. LE QUIEN, *Ad Damaſcenum de hæreſibus*, tom. i. p. 107. FORBES, *Inſtruction. Hiſtorico-Theolog.* lib. iii. cap. xix. p. 119. PHOTIUS *Biblioth. Cod.* ccxxx. p. 882.

[p] See GREGOR. ABULPHARAIUS *in* ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. i. p. 328.

[q] See FABRICII *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. cap. xxxvii. p. 358. HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iii. p. 1288. TIMOTHEUS, *De receptione hæreticorum in* COTELERII *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 414. JO. DAMASCENUS, *De hæreſibus*, tom. i. Opp. p. 103. edit. Le Quien.

[r] PHOTII *Biblioth. Cod.* xxiv. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 329.

[s] JOS. SIM. ASSEMAN. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 78. 332, &c.

THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events, which happened to the church during this century.

CENT. VII.

The Chriſtian religion introduced into *China*.

I. IN this century, the progreſs of Chriſtianity was mightily accelerated both in the eaſtern and weſtern hemiſpheres, and its divine light was diffuſed far and wide through the darkened nations. The Neſtorians, who dwelt in *Syria*, *Perſia*, and *India*, contributed much to its propagation in the eaſt, by the zeal and diligence, the laborious efforts and indefatigable aſſiduity with which they preached it to thoſe fierce and barbarous nations, who lived in the remoteſt borders and deſarts of *Aſia*, and among whom, as we learn from authentic records, their miniſtry was crowned with remarkable ſucceſs. It was by the labours of this ſect, that the light of the goſpel firſt penetrated into the immenſe empire of *China*, about the year 637, when JESUIABAS of *Gadala* was at the head of the Neſtorians, as will appear probable to thoſe who look upon as genuine the famous Chineſe monument, which was diſcovered, at *Siganfù*, by the Jeſuits during the laſt century [*a*]. Some, indeed, look upon this famous monument to be a mere fogery of the jeſuites, though, perhaps, without reaſon; there are, however, other unexceptionable proofs, that the northern parts of *China*, even before this century, abounded with Chriſtians, who, for many ſucceeding ages, were under the inſpection of a Metropolitan ſent them by the Chaldean or Neſtorian patriarch [*b*].

[*a*] This celebrated monument has been publiſhed and explained by ſeveral learned writers, particularly by KIRCHER, in his *China Illuſtrata*, p. 53; by MULLER, in a treatiſe publiſhed at *Berlin* in 1672; by EUSEBE RENAUDOT, in his *Relations anciennes des Indes, et de la Chine de deux voyageurs Mahometans*, p. 228–271. publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1718, in 8vo; and by ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. cap. iv. § 7. p 538. We were promiſed a ſtill more accurate edition of this famous monument by the learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED BAYER, the greateſt proficient of this age in Chineſe erudition; but his death has blaſted our expectations. For my part, I ſee no reaſon to doubt of the genuineſs of this monument, nor can I underſtand what advantage could redound to the jeſuits from the invention of ſuch a fable. See LIRON, *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. ii. p. 500.

The Engliſh converted.

II. The attention and activity of the Greeks were ſo entirely occupied by their inteſtine diviſions, that they were little ſolicitous about the progreſs of Chriſtianity. In the weſt, **Augustin** laboured to extend the limits of the church, and to ſpred the light of the goſpel among the Anglo-Saxons; and, after his death, other monks were ſent from *Rome* to exert themſelves in the ſame glorious cauſe. Their efforts were attended with the deſired ſucceſs, and the efficacy of their labours was manifeſted in the converſion of the ſix Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto remained under the darkneſs of the ancient ſuperſtitions, to the Chriſtian faith, which gained ground by degrees, and was, at length, embraced univerſally throughout all *Britain* [*c*]. We are not, however, to imagine, that this univerſal change in favour of Chriſtianity was wholly due to the diſcourſes of the Roman monks and doctors; for other cauſes were certainly inſtrumental in accompliſhing this great event. And it is not to be doubted, that the influence which ſome Chriſtian queens and ladies of high diſtinction had upon their huſbands, and the pains they took to convert them to Chriſtianity, as alſo the ſevere and rigorous laws that were afterwards enacted againſt idolaters [*d*], contributed much to the progreſs of the goſpel.

As alſo the Gauls, the Suevi, the Frieſlanders, the Franks, and the Helvetii.

III. Many of the Britiſh, Scotch, and Iriſh eccleſiaſtics travelled among the Batavian, Belgic, and German nations, with the pious intention of propagating the knowledge of the truth, and of erecting churches and forming religious eſtabliſhments every where. This was the true reaſon which induced the Germans, in aftertimes, to found ſo many convents for the Scotch and Iriſh, of which ſome are yet in being [*e*].

Columban, an Iriſh monk, ſeconded by the labours of a few companions, had happily extirpated, in the preceding century, the ancient ſuperſtitions in *Gaul*, and the parts adjacent, where idolatry had taken the deepeſt root; he alſo carried the lamp of celeſtial truth among the Suevi, the Boii, the Franks, and other German nations [*f*], and perſevered in theſe pious and uſeful labours until his death, which happened A. D. 615. St. **Gal**, who was one of his companions, preached the goſpel to the Helvetii, and the Suevi [*g*]. St. **Kilian** ſet out from *Scotland*, the place of his nativity, and exerciſed the miniſterial function with ſuch ſucceſs among the eaſtern Franks, that vaſt numbers of them embraced Chriſtianity [h]. Towards the concluſion of this century, the famous WILLIBRORD, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied with eleven of his countrymen, *viz.* SUIDBERT, WIGBERT, ACCA, WILIBALD, UNIBALD, LEBWIN, the two EWALDS, WERENFRID, MARCELLIN, and ADALBERT, croſſed over into *Batavia*, which lay oppoſite to *Britain*, in order to convert the Frieſlanders to the religion of JESUS. From thence, in the year 692, they went into *Foſteland*, which moſt writers look upon to have been the ſame with the iſle of *Helgoland*, or *Heiligland*; but being cruelly treated there by RADBOD, king of the Frieſlanders, who put WIGBERT, one of the company, to death, they departed hence for *Cimbria*, and the adjacent parts of *Denmark*. They, however, returned to *Frieſland* A. D. 693, and were much more ſucceſsful than they had formerly been in oppoſing the ancient ſuperſtitions, and propagating the knowledge of the truth. WILLEBRORD was ordained, by the Roman pontif, archbiſhop of *Wilteburg*, now *Utrecht*, and died among the Batavians in a good old age: while his aſſociates continued to ſpred the light of the goſpel among the Weſtphalians, and the neighbouring countries [i].

[*b*] See Renaudot, l. c. p. 56. 68, &c. Assemanni *Biblioth.* &c. cap. ix. p. 522; the learned Bayer, in his Preface to his *Muſeum Sinicum,* p. 84. aſſures us, that he has in his hands ſuch proofs of the truth of what is here affirmed, as puts the matter beyond all doubt.

[*c*] Bedæ *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſt. Gentis Anglor.* lib. ii. cap. iii p. 91. cap. xiv. p. 116. lib. iii. cap. xxi. p. 162, &c. edit. Chifleti. Rapin Thoyras, tom. i. p. 227.

[*d*] Wilkins's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ,* tom. i. p. 222.

[*e*] See the *Acta Sanctorum,* tom. ii. Febr. p. 362.

[*f*] Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ordinis Benedicti,* tom. ii. p. 560. tom. iii. p. 72. 339, 500. Adamani lib. iii. *De S. Columbano, in* Canisii *Lection. Antiq.* tom. i. p. 674.

[*g*] Walafridi Strabonis *vita* S. Galli *in* Mabillon. *Actis SS. Ord. Benedict.* tom. ii. p. 228. Canisii *Lection. Antiq.* tom. i. p. 783.

The judgment we are to form of theſe apoſtles.

IV. Theſe voyages, and many others, undertaken in the cauſe of CHRIST, carry, no doubt, a ſpecious appearance of piety and zeal; but the impartial and attentive inquirer after truth will find it impoſſible to form the ſame favourable judgment of them all, or to applaud, without diſtinction, the motives that animated theſe laborious miſſionaries. That the deſigns of ſome of them were truly pious, and their characters, without reproach, is unqueſtionably certain. But it is equally certain, that this was neither the caſe of them all, nor even of the greateſt part of them. Many of them diſcovered, in the courſe of their miniſtry, the moſt turbulent paſſions, and diſhonoured the glorious cauſe in which they were engaged by their arrogance and ambition, their avarice and cruelty. They abuſed the power, which they had received from the Roman pontifs, of forming religious eſtabliſhments among the ſuperſtitious nations; and, inſtead of gaining ſouls to CHRIST, they uſurped a deſpotic dominion over their obſequious proſelytes; and exerciſed a princely authority over the countries where their miniſtry had been ſucceſsful. Nor are we to conſider, as entirely groundleſs, the ſuſpicions of thoſe who allege, that many of the monks, deſirous of rule and authority, concealed their vices under the maſk of religion, and endured, for a certain time, the auſterities of a rigid mortification and abſtinence, merely with a view to riſe in the church to the epiſcopal dignity.

The Jews compelled to embrace Chriſtianity.

V. The converſion of the Jews ſeemed at a ſtand in this century; few or none of that obſtinate nation embraced the goſpel in conſequence of an inward conviction of its truth, though in many places they were barbarouſly compelled, by the Chriſtians, to make an outward and feigned profeſſion of their faith in CHRIST. The emperor HERACLIUS incenſed againſt that miſerable people by the inſinuations, as it is ſaid, of the Chriſtian doctors, perſecuted them in a cruel manner, and ordered multitudes of them to be inhumanly dragged into the Chriſtian churches, in order to be baptized by violence and compulſion [*k*]. The ſame odious method of converting was practiſed in *Spain* and *Gaul*, by the monarchs of thoſe nations, againſt which even the biſhops of *Rome* expreſſed their diſpleaſure and indignation. Such were the horrid and abominable practices to which an ignorance of the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, and the barbarous genius of this age led the heralds of that divine religion, which was deſigned to ſpred abroad CHARITY upon earth, and to render mankind truly and rationally FREE.

---

[h] *Vita* S. KILIANI *in* CANISII *Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 171. JO. PET. DE LUDEWIG, *Scriptores rerum Würzburgenſ.* p. 966.

[i] ALCUINI *vita Willibrordi in* MABILLON, *Actis SS. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iii. part. I. p. 603. JO. MOLLERI *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 980.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. THE Chriſtians ſuffered leſs in this, than in the preceding centuries. They were ſometimes perſecuted by the Perſian monarchs, but ſtill recovered their former tranquillity after tranſitory ſcenes of violence and oppreſſion. In *England*, the new converts to Chriſtianity ſuffered various calamities under the petty kings, who governed in thoſe boiſterous times; but theſe kings embraced the goſpel themſelves, and then the ſufferings of the Chriſtians ceaſed. In the eaſtern countries, and particularly in *Syria* and *Palæſtine*, the Jews, at certain times, attacked the Chriſtians with a merciless fury [*l*]; but, however, with ſo little ſucceſs, that they always had reaſon to repent of their temerity, which was ſeverely chaſtized. It is true, the church had other enemies, even thoſe, who, under the treacherous profeſſion of Chriſtianity, were laying ſecret ſchemes for the reſtoration of Paganiſm; but they were too weak and too inconſiderable to form any attempts that could endanger the Chriſtian cauſe.

Mahomet appears.

II. But a new and moſt powerful enemy to the Chriſtian cauſe ſtarted up in *Arabia* A. D. 612, under the reign of HERACLIUS. This was MAHOMET, an illiterate man [*m*], but endowed by nature with the moſt flowing and attractive eloquence, and with a vaſt and penetrating genius [*n*], diſtinguiſhed alſo by the advantages he enjoyed from the place of his birth, which added a luſtre to his name and his undertakings. This adventurous impoſtor declared publicly, that he was commiſſioned, by God, to deſtroy polytheiſm and idolatry, and then to reform, firſt the religion of the Arabians, and afterwards the Jewiſh and Chriſtian worſhip. For theſe purpoſes he delivered a new law, which is known by the name of the *Koran* [o], or *Alcoran*; and having gained ſeveral victories over his enemies, he compelled an incredible multitude of perſons, both in *Arabia* and the neighbouring nations, to receive his doctrine, and range themſelves under his ſtandards. Elated with this rapid and unexpected ſucceſs, he extended yet further his ambitious views, and formed the vaſt and arduous project of founding an empire. Here again, ſucceſs crowned his adventurous efforts; and his plan was executed with ſuch intrepidity and impudence, that he died maſter of all *Arabia*, beſides ſeveral adjacent provinces.

[*k*] EUTYCHII *Annales Eccleſiaſt. Alexandr.* tom. ii. p. 212.

[*l*] EUTYCHII *Annales*, tom. ii. p. 236. JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſtoria Orientalis*, lib. i. cap. iii. p. 129.

[*m*] MAHOMET himſelf expreſſly declared, that he was totally ignorant of all branches of learning and ſcience, and was even unable either to write or read: and his followers have drawn from this ignorance an argument in favour of the divinity of his miſſion, and of the religion he taught. It is, however, ſcarcely credible, that his ignorance was ſuch as it is here deſcribed, and ſeveral of his ſect have called in queſtion the declarations of their chief relating to this point. See CHARDIN, *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. iv. p. 33, 34. If we conſider that MAHOMET carried on, for a conſiderable time, a ſucceſsful commerce in *Arabia*, and the adjacent countries, this alone will convince us, that he muſt have been, in ſome meaſure, inſtructed in the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, with the knowledge of which a merchant cannot diſpenſe.

[*n*] The writers, to whom we are indebted for accounts of the life and religion of MAHOMET,

What judgment we are to form of Mahomet.

III. It is, perhaps, impoſſible at this time, to form ſuch an accurate judgment of the character, views, and conduct of MAHOMET, as would entirely ſatisfy the curioſity of a ſagacious inquirer after truth. To give entire credit to the Grecian writers in this matter, is neither prudent nor ſafe, ſince their bitter reſentment againſt this hoſtile invader led them to invent, without ſcruple or heſitation, fables and calumnies to blacken his character. The Arabians, on the other hand, are as little to be truſted to; as their hiſtorians are deſtitute of veracity and candour, conceal the vices and enormities of their chief, and repreſent him as the moſt divine perſon that ever appeared upon earth, and as the beſt gift of God to the world. Add to this, that a conſiderable part of MAHOMET's life, and indeed that part of it that would be the moſt proper to lead us to a true knowledge of his character, and of the motives from which he acted, is abſolutely unknown. It is highly probable, that he was ſo deeply affected with the odious and abominable ſuperſtition which diſhonoured his country, that it threw him into a certain fanatical

---

are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Delectus et Syllabus argumentor. pro veritate relig. Chriſtianæ*, cap. l. p. 733. To which we may add, BOULAINVILLIERS, *Vie de Mahomet*, publiſhed at *London*, in 8^{vo}, in the year 1730, and which deſerves rather the character of a romance, than of a hiſtory. GAGNIER, *Vie de Mahomet*, printed at *Amſterdam*, in two volumes in 8^{vo}, in 1732, and commendable both for the learning and candour with which it appears to have been compoſed; and, above all, the moſt learned and judicious SALE's *Preliminary Diſcourſe*, prefixed to his *Engliſh tranſlation of the Koran*, § 2. p. 37.

[o] For an account of the *Koran*, ſee principally the learned SALE's Preface to his Engliſh tranſlation of that work. See alſo VERTOT's *Diſcours ſur l'Alcoran*, which is ſubjoined to the third volume of his *Hiſtory of the Knights of Malta*, and CHARDIN's *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 281. The book, which the Mahometans call the *Koran*, or *Alcoran*, is compoſed of ſeveral papers and diſcourſes of MAHOMET, which were diſcovered and collected after his death, and is by no means that ſame *law*, whoſe excellence MAHOMET vaunted ſo highly. That ſome parts of the true *Koran* may be copied in the modern one is indeed very poſſible; but that the *Koran* or *Law*, given by MAHOMET to the Arabians, is entirely diſtinct from the modern *Alcoran* is manifeſt from this, that in the latter, MAHOMET appeals to and extols the former, and therefore they muſt be two different compoſitions. May it not be conjectured, that the true *Koran* was an Arabic poem, which MAHOMET recited to his followers without giving it to them in writing, ordering them only to commit it to their memory. Such were the laws of the Druids in *Gaul*, and ſuch alſo thoſe of the Indians, which the Bramins receive by oral tradition, and get by heart.

diſorder of mind, and made him really imagine that he was ſupernaturally commiſſioned to reform the religion of the Arabians, and to reſtore among them the worſhip of one God. It is, however, at the ſame time, undoubtedly evident, that, when he ſaw his enterprize crowned with the deſired ſucceſs, he made uſe of impious frauds to eſtabliſh the work he had ſo happily begun, deluded the giddy and credulous multitude by various artifices, and even forged celeſtial viſions to confirm his authority and remove the difficulties that frequently aroſe in the courſe of his affairs. This mixture of impoſture is, by no means, incompatible with a ſpirit of enthuſiaſm; for the fanatic, through the unguided warmth of zeal, looks often upon the artifices, that are uſeful to his cauſe, as pious and acceptable to the ſupreme being, and therefore deceives when he can do it with impunity [*p*]. The religion which Mahomet taught is certainly different from what it would have been, if he had met with no oppoſition, in the propagation of his opinions. The difficulties he had to encounter obliged him to yield, in ſome reſpects, to the reigning ſyſtems; the obſtinate attachment of the Arabians to the religion of their anceſtors on the one hand, and the fond hope of gaining over to his cauſe both the Jews and Chriſtians on the other, engaged, no doubt, this fanatical impoſtor to admit into his ſyſtem ſeveral tenets, which he would have rejected without heſitation, had he been free from the reſtraints of ambition and artifice.

The cauſes which contributed to the rapid progreſs of the Mahometan religion.

IV. The rapid ſucceſs, which attended the propagation of this new religion, was owing to cauſes that are plain and evident, and muſt remove, or rather prevent, our ſurprize, when they are attentively conſidered. The terror of Mahomet's arms, and the repeated victories which were gained by him and his ſucceſſors, were, no doubt, the irreſiſtible argument that perſuaded ſuch multitudes to embrace his religion, and ſubmit to his dominion. Beſides, his law was artfully and marvellouſly adapted to the corrupt nature of man; and, in a more particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the eaſtern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted; for the articles of faith which it propoſed were few in number, and extremely ſimple; and the duties it required were neither many, nor difficult, nor ſuch as were incompatible with the empire of appetites and paſſions [*q*]. It is to be obſerved further, that the groſs ignorance, under which the Arabians, Syrians, Perſians, and the greateſt part of the eaſtern nations, laboured at this time, rendered many an eaſy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To theſe cauſes of the progreſs of Mahometiſm, we may add the bitter diſſenſions and cruel animoſities that reigned among the Chriſtian ſects, particularly the Greeks, Neſtorians, Eutychians, and Monophyſites, diſſenſions that filled a great part of the eaſt with carnage, aſſaſſinations, and ſuch deteſtable enormities, as rendered the very name of Chriſtianity odious to many. We might add here, that the Monophyſites and Neſtorians, full of reſentment againſt the Greeks, from whom they had ſuffered the bittereſt and moſt injurious treatment, aſſiſted the Arabians in the conqueſt of ſeveral provinces [r], into which, of conſequence, the religion of MAHOMET was afterwards introduced. Other cauſes of the ſudden progreſs of that religion, will naturally occur to ſuch as conſider attentively its ſpirit and genius, and the ſtate of the world at this time.

[*p*] This, methinks, is the beſt way of adjuſting the controverſy that has been carried on by ſome learned men upon this curious queſtion, *viz.* Whether Mahomet was a fanatic, or an impoſtor? See Bayle's *Dictionary*, at the article Mahomet. Ocklrys's *Conqueſt of Syria, Perſia, and Egypt by the Saracens*, vol. i. p. 62. Sale's Preface to his tranſlation of the *Alcoran*, § 2. p. 39.

[*q*] See Reland, *De religione Mahumedica*. Sale's *Preliminary Diſcourſe*.

The treatment which the Chriſtians receive from the Mahometans.

V. After the death of MAHOMET, which happened A. D. 632, his followers, led on by an amazing intrepidity, and a fanatical fury, and aſſiſted, as we have already obſerved, by thoſe Chriſtians whom the Greeks had treated with ſuch ſeverity, extended their conqueſts beyond the limits of *Arabia*, and ſubdued *Syria*, *Perſia*, *Egypt*, and other countries under their dominion. On the other hand, the Greeks exhauſted with civil diſcords, and wholly occupied by inteſtine troubles, were unable to ſtop theſe intrepid conquerors in their rapid career.

For ſome time theſe enthuſiaſtic invaders uſed their proſperity with moderation, and treated the Chriſtians, and particularly thoſe among them who rejected the decrees of the councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, with the utmoſt indulgence and lenity. But as an uninterrupted courſe of ſucceſs and proſperity renders, too generally corrupt, mortals inſolent and imperious, ſo the moderation of this victorious ſect degenerated, by degrees, into ſeverity; and they treated the Chriſtians, at length, rather like ſlaves, than citizens, loading them with unſupportable taxes, and obliging them to ſubmit to a variety of vexatious and oppreſſive meaſures.

The Mahometans divided.

VI. The progreſs, however, of this triumphant ſect received a conſiderable check by the civil diſſenſions which aroſe among them immediately after the death of MAHOMET. ABUBEKER and ALI, the former the father-in-law, and the latter the ſon-in-law of this pretended prophet, aſpired both to ſucceed him in the empire which he had erected. Upon this aroſe a tedious and cruel conteſt, whoſe flame reached to ſucceeding ages, and produced that ſchiſm which divided the Mahometans into two great factions, whoſe ſeparation not only gave riſe to a variety of opinions and rites, but alſo excited the moſt implacable hatred, and the moſt deadly animoſities. Of theſe factions, the one acknowledged ABUBEKER as the true *calif*, or ſucceſſor of MAHOMET, and its members were diſtinguiſhed by the name of Sonnites; while the other adhered to ALI, and were known by the title of Schiites [s]. Both however adhered to the Alcoran as a divine law, and the rule of faith and manners; to which, indeed, the former added, by way of interpretation, the *ſonna*, i. e. a certain law which they looked upon as deſcended from MAHOMET by oral tradition, and which the Schiites refuſed to admit. Among the Sonnites, or followers of ABUBEKER, we are to reckon the Turks, Tartars, Arabians, Africans, and the greateſt part of the Indian Mahometans; whereas the Perſians, and the ſubjects of the Grand Mogul are generally conſidered as the followers of ALI; though the latter indeed ſeem rather to obſerve a ſtrict neutrality in this conteſt.

---

[r] See OCKLEYS's *Conqueſt of Syria, Perſia, and Egypt by the Saracens*, the firſt part of which was publiſhed at *London*, in the year 1708, and the ſecond in 1717.

[s] See RELAND, *De religione Turcica*, lib. i. p. 36. 70. 74. 85. CHARDIN's *Voyage en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 236.

Beſides theſe two grand factions, there are other ſubordinate ſects among the Mahometans, which diſpute with warmth concerning ſeveral points of religion, though without violating the rules of mutual toleration [t]. Of theſe ſects there are four, which far ſurpaſs the reſt in point of reputation and importance.

---

[t] For an account of the Mahometan ſects, ſee HOTTINGER. *Hiſtor. Orient.* lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 340. RICAUT, *Etat de l'Empire Ottoman*, livr. ii. p. 242. CHARDIN's *Voyages en Perſe*, tom. ii. p. 236. SALE's *Preliminary Diſcourſe*, § 8. p. 151.

PART

PART II.

The Internal History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning.

I. NOTHING can equal the ignorance and darkneſs that reigned in this century; the moſt impartial and accurate account of which will appear incredible to thoſe who are unacquainted with the productions of this barbarous period. Any remains of learning and philoſophy that yet ſurvived, were, a few particular caſes excepted, to be found principally among the Latins, in the obſcure retreats of cloiſtered monks. The monaſtic inſtitutions prohibited the election of any abbot to the head of a convent, who was not a man of learning, or, at leaſt, endowed with a tolerable meaſure of the erudition of the times. The monks were obliged to conſecrate certain hours every day to reading and ſtudy: and, that they might improve this appointment to the moſt advantageous purpoſes, there were, in moſt of the monaſteries, ſtated times marked out, at which they were to aſſemble in order to communicate to each other the fruits of their ſtudy, and to diſcuſs the matters upon which they had been reading [*a*]. The youth alſo, who were deſtined for the ſervice of the church, were obliged to prepare themſelves for their miniſtry by a diligent application to ſtudy; and in this they were directed by the monks, one of whoſe principal occupations it was to preſide over the education of the riſing prieſthood.

It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that all theſe inſtitutions were of little uſe to the advancement of ſolid learning, or of rational theology, becauſe very few in theſe days were acquainted with the true nature of the liberal arts and ſciences, or with the important ends which they were adapted to ſerve; and the greateſt part of thoſe who were looked upon as learned men, threw away their time in reading the marvellous lives of a parcel of fanatical ſaints, inſtead of employing it in the peruſal of well-choſen and excellent authors. They, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves moſt by their taſte and genius, carried their ſtudies little further than the works of Augustin and Gregory the Great; and it is of ſcraps collected out of theſe two writers, and patched together without much uniformity, that the beſt productions of this century are entirely compoſed.

The ignorance of the biſhops.

II. The ſciences enjoyed no degree of protection, at this time, from kings and princes, nor did they owe any thing to men of high and eminent ſtations in the empire. On the other hand, the ſchools which had been committed to the care and inſpection of the biſhops, whoſe ignorance and indolence were now become enormous, began to decline apace, and were, in many places, fallen into ruin [*b*]. The biſhops in general were ſo illiterate, that few of that body were capable of compoſing the diſcourſes which they delivered to the people. Such of them, as were not totally deſtitute of genius, compoſed out of the writings of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY a certain number of inſipid homilies, which they divided between themſelves and their ſtupid collegues, that they might not be obliged through incapacity to diſcontinue preaching the doctrines of Chriſtianity to their people, as appears evident by the examples of CÆSARIUS biſhop of *Arles*, and ELOI biſhop of *Noyon* [*c*]. There is yet extent a ſummary of theological doctrine, which was unſkilfully compiled by TAION biſhop of *Saragoſſa*, from the writings of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY; and which was ſo highly exalted in this illiterate age, that its author was called, by the reſt of the biſhops, the *true ſalt of the earth*, and a divine light that was ſent to illuminate the world [*d*]. Many ſuch inſtances of the ignorance and barbarity of this century will occur to thoſe who have any acquaintance with the writers it produced. *England*, it is true, was happier in this reſpect than the other nations of Europe, which was principally owing to THEODORE of *Tarſus*, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak afterwards, who was appointed archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and contributed much to introduce, among the Engliſh, a certain taſte for literary purſuits, and to excite in that kingdom a zeal for the advancement of learning [*e*].

[*a*] See Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 479. 513.

The Sciences and the art of writing ſunk into barbarity and corruption.

III. In *Greece*, the fate of the ſciences was truly lamentable. A turgid eloquence, and an affected pomp and ſplendor of ſtyle, which caſt a perplexing obſcurity over ſubjects, in themſelves the moſt clear and perſpicuous, was now the higheſt point of perfection to which both proſe writers and poets aſpired. The Latin eloquence was ſtill vaſtly below that of the Greeks; it had not ſpirit enough even to be turgid, and, a few compoſitions excepted, was ſunk to the very loweſt degree of barbarity and corruption. Both the Greek and Latin writers, who attempted hiſtorical compoſitions, degraded moſt miſerably that important ſcience. MOSCHUS and SOPHRONIUS among the former; and among the latter BRAULIO, JONAS an Hibernian, AUDOENUS, DADO, and ADAMANNUS, wrote the lives of ſeveral ſaints; or rather a heap of inſipid and ridiculous fables, void of the leaſt air of probability, and without the ſmalleſt tincture of eloquence. The Greeks related, without diſcernment or choice, the moſt vulgar reports that were handed about concerning the events of ancient times: and hence that multitude of abſurd fables, which the Latins afterwards copied from them with the utmoſt avidity.

The fate of philoſophy.

IV. Among the Latins philoſophy was at its loweſt ebb. If there were any that retained ſome faint reluctance to abandon it entirely, ſuch confined their ſtudies to the writings of BOETIUS and CASSIODORUS, from which they committed to memory a certain number of phraſes and ſentences; and that was all their philoſophical ſtock. The Greeks, abandoning PLATO to the monks, gave themſelves entirely up to the direction of ARISTOTLE, and ſtudied, with eagerneſs, the ſubtilties of his logic, which were of ſignal uſe in the controverſies carried on between the Monophyſites, the Neſtorians, and Monothelites. All theſe different ſects called the Stagirite to their aſſiſtance, when they were to plead their cauſe and to defend their doctrines. Hence it was, that JAMES, biſhop of *Edeſſa*, who was a Monophyſite, tranſlated, in this century, the dialectics of ARISTOTLE into the Syriac language [f].

[*b*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 428.

[(*c*) In the original we read ELIGIUS *Noviomagenſis*, which is a miſtake either of the author or printer. It is probable, that *Noviomagenſis* has ſlipt from the pen of Dr. MOSHEIM, in the place of *Noviodunenſis*; for ELOI was biſhop of *Noyon*, and not of *Nimuegen*.]

[*d*] MABILLON. *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. i. p. 42.

[*e*] WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 42. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ*, p. 277.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The diſputes about pre-eminence between the biſhops of Rome and Conſtantinople.

I. THE diſputes about pre-eminence, that had ſo long ſubſiſted between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, proceeded, in this century, to ſuch violent lengths, as laid the foundations of that deplorable ſchiſm, which afterwards ſeparated the Greek and Latin churches. The moſt learned writers, and thoſe who are moſt remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity, are generally agreed that BONIFACE III engaged PHOCAS, that abominable tyrant, who waded to the imperial throne, through the blood of the emperor MAURITIUS, to take from the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* the title of *œcumenical*, or *univerſal biſhop*, and to confer it upon the Roman pontif. They relate this, however, upon the ſole authority of BARONIUS; for none of the ancient writers have mentioned it. If, indeed, we are to give credit to ANASTASIUS and PAUL deacon [g], ſomething like what we have now related was tranſacted by PHOCAS; for when the biſhops of *Conſtantinople* maintained that their church was not only equal in dignity and authority to that of *Rome*, but alſo the head of all the Chriſtian churches, this tyrant oppoſed their pretenſions, and granted the pre-eminence to the church of *Rome*; and thus was the papal ſupremacy firſt introduced.

The ſupremacy of the former oppoſed by many.

II. The Roman pontifs uſed all ſorts of methods to maintain and enlarge the authority and pre-eminence, which they had acquired by a grant from the moſt odious tyrant that ever diſgraced the annals of hiſtory. We find, however, in the moſt authentic accounts of the tranſactions of this century, that not only ſeveral emperors and princes, but alſo whole nations, oppoſed the ambitious views of the biſhops of *Rome*. The Byzantine hiſtory, and the *Formulary* of MARCULFUS, contain many proofs of the influence, which the civil magiſtrate yet retained in religious matters, and of the ſubordination of the Roman pontifs to the regal authority. It is true, the Roman writers affirm, that CONSTANTINE POGONATUS abdicated the privilege of confirming, by his approbation, the election of the biſhop of that city; and, as a proof of this, they allege a paſſage of ANASTASIUS, in which it is ſaid, that, according to an edict of POGONATUS, *the pontif, who ſhould be elected, was to be ordained immediately, and without the leaſt delay* [h]. But every one muſt ſee, that this paſſage is inſufficient to prove what theſe writers aſſert with ſuch confidence. It is however certain, that this emperor abated, ſome ſay, remitted the ſum; which, ſince the time of THEODORIC, the biſhops of *Rome* had been obliged to pay to the imperial treaſury before they could be ordained, or have their election confirmed [i].

---

[f] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 498.

[g] ANASTASIUS, *De vitis Pontificum.* PAUL. DIACON. *De rebus geſtis Longobard.* lib. iv. cap. xxxvii. in MURATORII *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part. I. p. 46.

The ancient Britons and Scots perſiſted long in the maintenance of their religious liberty; and neither the threats nor promiſes of the legates of *Rome* could engage them to ſubmit to the decrees and authority of the ambitious pontif, as appears manifeſtly from the teſtimony of BEDE. The churches of *Gaul* and *Spain* attributed as much authority to the biſhop of *Rome*, as they thought ſuitable to their own dignity, and conſiſtent with their intereſts; nay, even in *Italy*, his ſupreme authority was obſtinately rejected, ſince the biſhop of *Ravenna*, and other prelates, refuſed an implicit ſubmiſſion to his orders [k]. Beſides all this, multitudes of private perſons expreſſed publicly, and without the leaſt heſitation, their abhorrence of the vices, and particularly of the lordly ambition of the Roman pontifs; and it is highly probable, that the Valdenſes or Vaudois had already, in this century, retired into the vallies of *Piedmont*, that they might be more at their liberty to oppoſe the tyranny of thoſe imperious prelates [l].

Vices of the clergy.

III. The progreſs of vice among the ſubordinate rulers and miniſters of the church was, at this time, truly deplorable; neither biſhops, preſbyters, deacons, nor even the cloiſtered monks, were exempt from the general contagion, as appears from the unanimous confeſſion of all the writers of this century, that are worthy of credit. In thoſe very places, that were conſecrated to the advancement of piety, and the ſervice of God, there was little elſe to be ſeen than ghoſtly ambition, inſatiable avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, and a ſupercilious contempt of the natural rights of the people, with many other vices ſtill more enormous. There reigned alſo in many places the moſt bitter diſſenſions between the biſhops and the monks. The former had employed the greedy hands of the latter to augment the epiſcopal treaſure, and to draw contributions from all parts to ſupport them in their luxury, and the indulgence of their luſts. The monks perceiving this, and alſo unwilling to ſerve the biſhops in ſuch a diſhonourable character, fled for refuge to the emperors and princes, under whoſe civil juriſdiction they lived; and afterwards, for their further ſecurity, had recourſe to the protection of the Roman pontif [m]. This protection they readily obtained, and the imperious pontifs, always fond of exerting their authority, exempted, by degrees, the monaſtic orders from the juriſdiction of the biſhops. The monks, in return for this important ſervice, devoted themſelves wholly to advance the intereſts, and to maintain the dignity of the biſhop of *Rome*. They made his cauſe their own, and repreſented him as a ſort of God to the ignorant multitude, over whom they had gained a prodigious aſcendant by the notion that generally prevailed of the ſanctity of the monaſtic order. It is, at the ſame time, to be obſerved, that this *immunity* of the monks was a fruitful ſource of licentiouſneſs and diſorder, and occaſioned the greateſt part of the vices with which they were afterwards ſo juſtly charged. Such, at leaſt, is the judgment of the beſt writers upon this ſubject [n].

---

[h] ANASTASII *vit. Pontif. in Bened.* p. 146. *in* MURATOR. *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. iii.

[i] ANASTAS. *vit. Pontif. in Agathone*, p. 144. compared with MASCOVII *Hiſt. German.* tom. ii. p. 121. in the annotations. [It will not be amiſs to obſerve here, that, by the ſame edict, which diminiſhed the ordination-money paid by the biſhops of *Rome* to the emperor, CONSTANTINE reſumed the power of confirming the election of the pope, which his predeceſſors had inveſted in the exarchs of *Ravenna*; ſo that the biſhop elect was not to be ordained till his election was notified to the court of *Conſtantinople*, and the imperial decree confirming it was received by the electors at *Rome*. See ANASTASIUS, his life of AGATHO.]

[k] See GEDDES, *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, tom. ii. p. 6.

[l] See ANTOINE LEGER's *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, livr. i. p. 15.

The ſtate of the monks.

IV. In the mean time the monks were every where in high repute, and their cauſe was accompanied with the moſt ſurprizing ſucceſs, particularly among the Latins, through the protection and favour of the Roman pontif, and their phariſaical affectation of uncommon piety and devotion. The heads of families ſtriving to ſurpaſs each other in their zeal for the propagation and advancement of monkery, dedicated their children to God by ſhutting them up in convents, and devoting them to a ſolitary life, which they looked upon as the higheſt felicity [o]; nor did they fail to ſend with theſe innocent victims a rich dowry. Abandoned profligates, who had paſſed their days in the moſt enormous purſuits, and whoſe guilty conſciences filled them with terror and remorſe, were comforted with the deluſive hopes of obtaining pardon, and making atonement for their crimes, by leaving the greateſt part of their fortune to ſome monaſtic ſociety. Multitudes, impelled by the unnatural dictates of a gloomy ſuperſtition, deprived their children of fertile lands and rich patrimonies, in favour of the monks, by whoſe prayers they hoped to render the deity propitious. Several eccleſiaſtics laid down rules for the direction of the monaſtic orders. Thoſe among the Latins, who undertook this pious taſk, were FRUCTUOSUS, ISIDORE, JOHANNES GERUNDINENSIS, and COLUMBA [p]. The rule of diſcipline, preſcribed by St. BENEDICT, was not as yet ſo univerſally followed as to exclude all others.

The Greek writers.

V. The writers of this age, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their genius or erudition, were very few in number. Among the Greeks, the firſt rank is due to MAXIMUS, a monk, who diſputed, with great obſtinacy and warmth, againſt the Monothelites, compoſed ſome illuſtrations upon the Holy Scriptures,

---

[m] See LAUNOII *Aſſertio inquiſitionis in Chartam Immunitatis S. Germani*, Opp. tom. iii. part. I. p. 50. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. ii. p. 159. tom. iv. p. 108. MURATORII *Antiqu. Italic.* tom. ii. p. 944. 949.

[n] See LAUNOII *Examen privilegii S. Germani*, tom. iii. part. I. p. 282. WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britaniæ*, tom. i. p. 43, 44. 49, &c.

[o] GERVAIS, *Hiſtoire de l'Abbé Suger*, tom. i. p. 9—16.

[p] LUCÆ HOLSTENII *Codex Regular.* tom. ii. p. 225.

tures, and was, upon the whole, a man of no mean capacity, though unhappy through the impatience and violence of his natural temper.

ISYCHIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, explained ſeveral books of ſcripture [q]; and left behind him ſeveral *Homilies*, and ſome productions of leſs importance.

DOROTHEUS, abbot of *Paleſtine*, acquired a conſiderable name by his *Aſcetic Diſſertations*, in which he laid down a plan of monaſtic life and manners.

ANTIOCHUS, a monk of SABA in *Paleſtine*, and a monk of a very ſuperſtitious complexion, compoſed a *Pandect of the Holy Scriptures*, i. e. a ſummary or ſyſtem of the Chriſtian doctrine, which is by no means worthy of the higheſt commendation.

SOPHRONIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, was rendered illuſtrious, and attracted the veneration of ſucceeding ages by the controverſies he carried on againſt thoſe who, at this time, were branded with the name of Heretics; and particularly againſt the Monothelites, of whoſe doctrine he was the firſt oppoſer, and alſo the fomenter of the diſpute which it occaſioned [r].

There are yet extant ſeveral *Homilies*, attributed to ANDREW biſhop of *Crete*, which are deſtitute of true piety and eloquence, and which are moreover conſidered by ſome writers as entirely ſpurious.

GREGORY, ſurnamed PISIDES, deacon of *Conſtantinople*, beſides the *Hiſtory of Heraclius and the Avares*, compoſed ſeveral poems, and other pieces of too little moment to deſerve mention.

THEODORE, abbot of *Raithu*, publiſhed a book, which is ſtill extant, againſt thoſe ſects who ſeemed to introduce corrupt innovations into the Chriſtian religion by their doctrine relating to the perſon of CHRIST.

The Latin writers.

VI. Among the Latin writers a certain number were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by their ſuperior abilities. ILDEFONSE, archbiſhop of *Toledo*, was reputed for his learning; the Spaniards, however, attribute to him, without foundation, certain treatiſes concerning the Virgin MARY [s].

We have yet extant *Two books of epiſtles*, written by DESIDERIUS, biſhop of *Cahors*, and publiſhed by the learned CANISIUS.

ELIGIUS, or ELOI, biſhop of *Limoges*, left behind him ſeveral *Homilies*, and ſome other productions.

MARCULF, a Gallic monk, compoſed *Two books of eccleſiaſtical forms*, which are highly valuable, as they are extremly proper to give us a juſt idea of the deplorable ſtate of religion and learning in this century [t].

ALDHELM, an Engliſh prelate, compoſed ſeveral poems *Concerning the Chriſtian life*, which exhibit but indifferent marks of genius and fancy [u].

---

[q] See SIMON *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 261.

[r] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Martii ad* d. xi. p. 65.

[s] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, *Januar.* tom. ii. p. 535.

[t] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 565.

[(u) This prelate certainly deſerved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by Dr. MOSHEIM. His poetical talents were by no means the moſt diſtinguiſhing part of his character. He was profoundly verſed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared alſo with dignity in the *paſchal* controverſy, that ſo long divided the Saxon and Britiſh churches. See COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt.* vol. i. p. 121.

JULIAN POMERIUS confuted the Jews, and acquired a name by ſeveral other productions, which are neither worthy of much applauſe, nor of utter contempt. To all theſe we might add CRESCONIUS, whoſe *Abridgment of the canons* is well known; FREDEGARIUS the hiſtorian; and a few others.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The deplorable ſtate of religion.

I. IN this barbarous age, religion lay expiring under a motley and enormous heap of ſuperſtitious inventions, and had neither the courage nor the force to raiſe her head, or to diſplay her native charms, to a darkened and deluded world. In the earlier periods of the church, the worſhip of Chriſtians was confined to the one ſupreme God, and his ſon JESUS CHRIST: but the Chriſtians of this century multiplied the objects of their devotion, and paid homage to the remains of the true croſs, to the images of ſaints, and to bones, whoſe real owners were extremely dubious [*w*]. The primitive Chriſtians, in order to excite men to a courſe of piety and virtue, ſet before them that heavenly ſtate, and thoſe manſions of miſery, which the goſpel has revealed as the different portions of the righteous and the wicked: while the Chriſtians of this century talked of nothing elſe but a certain fire, which effaced the ſtains of vice, and purified ſouls from their corruption. The *former* taught that CHRIST, by his ſufferings and death, had made atonement for the ſins of mortals; the *latter* ſeemed, by their ſuperſtitious doctrine, to exclude from the kingdom of heaven, ſuch as had not contributed, by their offerings, to augment the riches of the clergy, or the church [*x*]. The *former* were only

[*w*] It will not be amiſs to quote here a remarkable paſſage out of *The life of St.* ELIGIUS, or ELOI, biſhop of *Noyon*, which is to be found in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 92. This paſſage, which is very proper to give us a juſt idea of the piety of this age, is as follows: "Huic ſanctiſſimo viro inter cetera virtutum ſuarum miracula id etiam a "Domino conceſſum erat, ut ſanctorum martyrum corpora, quæ per tot ſæcula abdita populis "hactenus habebantur, eo inveſtigante ac nimio ardore fidei indagante, patefacta proderentur." It appears by this paſſage, that St. ELOI was a zealous relick-hunter, and, if we may give credit to the writer of his life, he was very ſucceſsful at this kind of game; for he ſmelt and unkenneled the carcaſes of St. QUINTIN, St. PLATO, St. CRISPIN, St. CRISPINIAN, St. LUCIAN, and many more. The biſhops of this age, who were either ambitiouſly deſirous of popular applauſe, or intent upon accumulating riches and filling their coffers with the oblations of a ſuperſtitious people, pretended to be endowed with a miraculous ſagacity in diſcovering the bodies of ſaints and martyrs.

[*x*] St. ELIGIUS, or ELOI, expreſſes himſelf upon this matter in the following manner: "Bonus Chriſtianus eſt, qui ad eccleſiam frequenter venit, *et oblationem*, qui in altari Deo offeratur, exhibet; qui de fructibus ſuis non guſtat, niſi prius Deo aliquid offerat; qui, quoties "ſanctæ ſolemnitates adveniunt, ante dies plures caſtitatem etiam cum propria uxore cuſtodit, "ut ſecura conſcientia Domini altare accedere poſſit; qui poſtremo ſymbolum vel orationem "Dominicam memoriter tenet.—Redimite animas veſtras de pœna, dum habetis in poteſtate "remedia—oblationes et decimas eccleſiis offerte, luminaria ſanctis locis, juxta quod habetis, "exhibete—ad eccleſiam quoque frequentius convenite, ſanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite—quod ſi obſervaveritis, ſecuri in die judicii ante tribunal æterni judicis venientes "dicetis: Da, Domine, quia dedimus." [We ſee here a large and ample deſcription of the character of a *good Chriſtian*, in which there is not the leaſt mention of the *love of God*, *reſignation*

ſtudious to attain to a virtuous ſimplicity of life and manners, and employed their principal zeal and diligence in the culture of true and genuine piety; while the *latter* placed the whole of religion in external rites and bodily exerciſes. The methods alſo of ſolving the difficulties, and diſſipating the doubts that often aroſe in inquiſitive minds, were of a piece with the reſt of the ſuperſtitious ſyſtem that now prevailed. The two great and irreſiſtible arguments againſt all doubts, were *the authority of the church*, and the *working of miracles*: and the production of theſe prodigies required no extraordinary degree of dexterity in an age of ſuch groſs and univerſal ignorance.

The expoſitors of the Holy Scriptures.

II. Few either of the Greeks or Latins applied themſelves to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures during this century. There are yet extant ſome commentaries of ISYCHIUS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, upon certain books of *the Old Teſtament*, and upon *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*. MAXIMUS publiſhed a ſolution of LXV *queſtions relating to the Holy Scriptures*, and other productions of the ſame nature. JULIAN POMERIUS attempted, but without ſucceſs, to reconcile the ſeeming contradictions that are to be found in the ſacred writings, and to explain the prophecy of NAHUM. All theſe writers were manifeſtly inferior to the meaneſt expoſitors of modern times. The Grecian doctors, particularly thoſe who pretended to be initiated in the moſt myſterious depths of theology, were continually hunting after fantaſtic allegories, as is evident from the *queſtions of* MAXIMUS already mentioned. The Latins, on the contrary, were ſo diffident of their abilities, that they did not dare to enter theſe allegorical labyrinths, but contented themſelves with what flowers they could pluck out of the rich collections of GREGORY and AUGUSTIN. Of this we ſee a manifeſt example in PATERIUS's *Expoſition of the Old and New Teſtament*, which is entirely compiled from the writings of GREGORY the GREAT [y] Among the interpreters of this century, we muſt not forget THOMAS biſhop of *Heraclea*, who gave a ſecond Syriac verſion of all the books of the New Teſtament [z].

Didactic theology.

III. While philoſophy and theology had ſcarcely any remains of life, any marks of exiſtence among the Latins, the Greeks were wholly occupied with controverſies about certain particular branches of religion, and never once thought of reducing all the doctrines of Chriſtianity into one regular and rational ſyſtem. It is true, ANTIOCHUS, a monk of *Paleſtine*, compoſed a ſhort ſummary of the Chriſtian doctrine, which he intitled, *The pandect of the Holy Scriptures*. It is, however, eaſy to perceive what ſort of an author he was, how void of dignity and true judgment, from many circumſtances, and particularly, from that rueful poem which is ſubjoined to his work, in which he deplores, in lamentable ſtrains, the loſs of that precious fragment of the true croſs, which is ſaid to have been carried away, by the Perſians, among other

---

to his will, *obedience* to his laws, or of *juſtice*, *benevolence*, and *charity* towards men; in which the whole of religion is made to conſiſt in *coming often to church*, *bringing offerings to the altar*, *lighting candles* in conſecrated places, and ſuch like vain ſervices.]

[y] This uſeleſs production has been uſually publiſhed with the works of GREGORY the GREAT: in conſequence of which, the Benedictin monks have inſerted it in their ſplendid edition of the works of that pontif, tom. iv. part. II.

[z] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 93, 94.

other ſpoils. The moſt elegant and judicious ſummary of theology that appeared among the Latins in this century, was the *Treatiſe of* ILDEFONSE *de cognitione baptiſmi*, which was ſaved, by BALUZIUS, from the ruins of time; a work, indeed, which is not extremely neceſſary ſince the impious frauds of ſuperſtition have been ſo fully brought to light, though it contains remarkable proofs, that many of the corrupt additions and inventions, which diſfigure Chriſtianity in the popiſh churches, were not invented till after this period [*a*]. The dry and inſipid body of divinity, compoſed by TAIO, or TAGO, biſhop of *Saragoſſa*, under the title of *Five books of ſentences*, and compiled from the writings of GREGORY and AUGUSTIN, is ſcarcely worthy of mention, though, in this century, it was conſidered as an admirable and immortal work [*b*].

Several particular branches of doctrine were treated by the theological writers of this age: Thus MAXIMUS wrote concerning the nature of *Theology*, and the *Manifeſtation of the ſon in the fleſh*, and alſo concerning the *Two natures in* CHRIST; and THEODORE RAITHU, compoſed a treatiſe concerning CHRIST's *Incarnation*. But a ſmall acquaintance with the ſtate of learning and religion, at this period, will enable us to form a juſt, though diſadvantageous, idea of the merit of theſe performances, and alſo of their authors.

Moral writers.

IV. The moral writers of this century, and their miſerable productions, ſhew too plainly to what a wretched ſtate that noble and important ſcience was now reduced. Among theſe moraliſts, the firſt rank is due to DOROTHEUS, author of the *Aſcetic Diſſertations*; MAXIMUS; ALDHELM; HESYCHIUS; THALASSIUS; and ſome others; yet even in their productions, what groveling notions do we find? What rubbiſh, what an heap of ſuperſtitious fancies, and how many marks of extravagance, perplexity, and doubt? Beſides; the *laity* had little reaſon to complain of the ſeverity of their moral directors, whoſe cuſtom it was to reduce all the obligations of Chriſtianity to the practice of a ſmall number of virtues, as appears from ALDHELM's *Treatiſe concerning the eight principal virtues*. Nor was the neglect of theſe duties attended with ſuch penalties as were proper to reſtrain offenders. The falſe notions alſo, which prevailed in this age, tended much to diminiſh a juſt ſenſe of the nature and obligation of virtue; for the ſolitude of the monaſtic life, though accompanied with no marks of ſolid and genuine piety, was deemed ſufficient to atone for all ſorts of crimes, and was therefore honoured among the Latins with the title of the *ſecond baptiſm*, which circumſtance, alone, may ſerve to ſhew us the miſerable ſtate of Chriſtianity at this time. The greateſt part of the Grecian and Oriental monks laboured to arrive at a ſtate of perfection by mere contemplation, and ſtudiouſly endeavoured to form their temper and characters after the model of DIONYSIUS, the chief of the Myſtics.

[*a*] See BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vi. p. 1. From the work of ILDEFONSUS it appears evident, that the monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* was abſolutely unknown to the Latins in this century. See C. 137. p. 99. that the Holy Scriptures were in the hands of all Chriſtians, and were peruſed by them without the leſt moleſtation or reſtraint, C. 80. p. 59. ILDEFONSUS, it is true, is zealous in baniſhing reaſon and philoſophy from religious matters; he, however, eſtabliſhes the *Holy Scriptures* and the *Writings of the ancient doctors* as the ſupreme tribunals, before which all theological opinions are to be tried, p. 14. 22.

[*b*] See MABILLON *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 68.

The renewal of penitential diſcipline.

V. THEODORE of *Tarſus*, a Grecian monk, reſtored among the Latins the diſcipline of *penance*, as it is commonly termed, which had been for a long time almoſt totally neglected, and enforced it by a body of ſevere laws borrowed from the Grecian canons. This zealous prelate, being raiſed beyond his expectation to the ſee of *Canterbnry* A. D. 668, formed and executed ſeveral pious and laudable projects; and among other things reduced to a regular ſcience, that branch of eccleſiaſtical law, which is known by the name of *penitential diſcipline*. He publiſhed a *penitential*, which was entirely new to the Latin world, by which the clergy were taught to diſtinguiſh ſins into various claſſes, according as they were more or leſs heinous, private or public; to judge of them and determine the degrees of their guilt by their nature and conſequences; the intention of the offender; the time and place in which they were committed; and the circumſtances with which they were attended. This new *penitential* contained alſo the methods of proceeding with reſpect to offenders; pointed out the penalties that were ſuitable to the various claſſes of tranſgreſſions; preſcribed the forms of *conſolation*, *exhortation*, and *abſolution*; and deſcribed, in an ample and accurate manner, the duties and obligations of thoſe who were to receive the confeſſions of the penitent [c]. This new diſcipline, though of Grecian origin, was eagerly adopted by the Latin churches; and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, paſſed from *Britain* into all the weſtern provinces, where the book of THEODORE became the model of all other *penitentials*, and was multiplied in a vaſt number of copies. The duration of this diſcipline was but tranſitory; for, in the eighth century, it began to decline, and was, at length, entirely ſupplanted by, what was called, the new cannon of *indulgences*.

The ſtate of Polemic theology.

VI. The doctors, who oppoſed the various ſects, are ſcarcely worthy of mention, and would deſerve ſtill leſs an attentive peruſal, did not their writings contribute to illuſtrate the hiſtory of the times in which they lived. NICIAS compoſed two books *againſt the Gentiles*; and PHOTIUS informs us, that a certain writer, whoſe name is unknown, embarked in the ſame controverſy, and ſupported the good cauſe by a prodigious number of arguments drawn from ancient records and monuments [d]. JULIAN POMERIUS exerted his polemic talent againſt the Jews. The views of TIMOTHEUS were yet more entenſive; for he gave an ample deſcription and a laboured confutation of all the various *hereſies* that divided the church, in his book *Concerning the reception of Heretics*.

As to the diſſenſions of the Catholic Chriſtians among themſelves, they produced, at this time, few or no events worthy of mention. We ſhall, therefore, only obſerve, that in this century were ſown the ſeeds of thoſe fatal diſcords, which rent aſunder the bonds of Chriſtian communion between the Greek and Latin churches; nay, theſe ſeeds had already taken root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman power became inſupportable, and the pretenſions of the ſovereign pontif odious.

---

[c] The *Penitential* of THEODORE is yet extant, though maimed and imperfect, in an edition publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1679, in 4to by PETIT; and enriched with learned diſſertations and notes of the editor. We have alſo the cxx *Capitula Eccleſiaſt.* THEODORI, publiſhed in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium*, tom. ix. and in the *Concilia* HARDUINI, tom. iii. p. 1771.

[d] *Biblioth. Cod.* clxx. p. 379.

In *Britain*, warm controverſies concerning baptiſm, the tonſure, and particularly the famous diſpute concerning the time of celebrating the Eaſter feſtival, were carried on between the ancient Britons and the new converts to Chriſtianity, which AUGUSTIN had made among the Anglo-Saxons [*e*]. The fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity were not at all affected by theſe controverſies, which, on that account, were more innocent and leſs important than they would have otherwiſe been. Beſides, they were entirely terminated, in the eighth century, in favour of the Anglo-Saxons, by the Benedictine monks [*f*].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Religious rites multiplied.

I. IN the council of *Conſtantinople*, which was called *Quiniſextum* [*g*], the Greeks enacted ſeveral laws concerning the ceremonies that were to be obſerved in divine worſhip, which rendered their ritual, in ſome reſpects, different from that of the Romans. Theſe laws were publicly received by all the churches, which were eſtabliſhed in the dominions of the Grecian emperors; and alſo by thoſe which were joined with them in communion and doctrine, though under the civil juriſdiction of Barbarian princes. Nor was this all: for every Roman pontif added ſomething new to the ancient rites and inſtitutions, as if it was an eſſential mark of their zeal for religion, and of their pious diſcharge of the miniſterial function to divert the multitude with new ſhews and new ſpectacles of devout mommery. Theſe ſuperſtitious inventions were, in the time of CHARLEMAGNE, propagated from *Rome* among the other Latin churches, whoſe ſubjection to the Roman ritual was neceſſary to ſatisfy the ambitious demands of the lordly pontif.

[*e*] CUMMANI *Epiſtola* in JAC. USSERII *Sylloge Epiſtolar. Hibernicar.* p. 23. BEDÆ *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſt. gentis Anglor.* lib iii. cap. xxv. WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britann.* tom. i. p. 37. 42. *Acta Sanctor. Februar.* tom. iii. p. 21. 84. [See alſo Dr. WARDNER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, book II and III. This hiſtory, which has lately appeared, deſerves the higheſt applauſe on account of that noble ſpirit of liberty, candour, and moderation that ſeems to have guided the pen of the judicious author. It were, at the ſame time, to be wiſhed, that this elegant hiſtorian had leſs avoided citing authorities, and been a little more laviſh of that erudition which he is known to poſſeſs; for then, after having ſurpaſſed COLLIER in all other reſpects, he would have equalled him in that depth and learning,, which are the only meritorious circumſtances of his partial and diſagreeable hiſtory.]

[*f*] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iii. *Benedictinum*, p. 2. [See alſo Dr. WARDNER's *Eccleſiaſt. Hiſt.* book III.]

[(*g*) This council was called *Quiniſextum*, from its being conſidered as a ſupplement to the fifth and ſixth councils of *Conſtantinople*, in which nothing had been decreed concerning the morals of Chriſtians, or religious ceremonies.]

Some examples of this addition to the ritual.

II. It will not be improper to ſelect here a few out of the many inſtances we could produce of the multiplication of religious rites in this century. The number of feſtivals, under which the church already groaned, was now augmented; a new feſtival was inſtituted in honour of the true croſs on which Chriſt ſuffered, and another in commemoration of the Saviour's aſcenſion into heaven. BONIFACE V enacted that infamous law, by which the churches became places of refuge to all who fled thither for protection; a law which procured a ſort of impunity to the moſt enormous crimes, and gave a looſe rein to the licentiouſneſs of the moſt abandoned profligates. HONORIUS employed all his diligence and zeal in embelliſhing churches, and other conſecrated places with the moſt pompous and magnificent ornaments; for as neither CHRIST, nor his apoſtles, had left any injunctions of this nature to their followers, their pretended vicar thought it but juſt to ſupply this defect by the moſt ſplendid diſplay of his oſtentatious beneficence. We ſhall paſs in ſilence the riches and variety of the ſacerdotal garments that were now uſed at the celebration of the euchariſt, and in the performance of divine worſhip, as this would lead us into a tedious detail of minute and unimportant matters.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

The remains of the ancient ſects.

I. THE Greeks were engaged, during this century, in the moſt bitter and virulent controverſy with the PAULICIANS, whom they conſidered as a branch of the Manichean ſect, and who were ſettled in *Armenia* and the adjacent countries. This diſpute was carried to the greateſt height under the reigns of CONSTANS, CONSTATINE, POGONATUS, and JUSTINIAN II; and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were alſo ſeconded by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws. A certain perſon, whoſe name was CONSTANTINE, revived under the reign of CONSTANS, the drooping faction of the PAULICIANS, which was now ready to expire; and propagated, with great ſucceſs, its peſtilential doctrines [*h*]. But this is not the place to enlarge upon the tenets and hiſtory of this ſect, whoſe origin is attributed to PAUL and JOHN, two brothers, who revived and modified the doctrine of MANES. As it was in the ninth century that the Paulicians flouriſhed moſt, and acquired ſtrength ſufficient to ſupport the rigours of an open and cruel war with the Greeks, we ſhall reſerve a more particular account of them for our hiſtory of that period.

Paulicians.

Arians.

Pelagians.

II. In *Italy*, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the Arians to the doctrine which was eſtabliſhed by the council of *Nice*. In *Gaul* and in *England*, the Pelagian and Semi-pelagian controverſies continued to excite the warmeſt animoſities and diſſenſions. In the eaſtern provinces, the ancient ſects, which had been weakened and oppreſſed by the imperial laws, but neither totally extirpated nor deſtroyed, began, in many places, to raiſe their heads, to recover their vigour, and to gain proſelytes. The terror of penal laws had obliged them, for ſome time, to ſeek their ſafety in their obſcurity, and therefore to conceal their opinions from the public eye; but as ſoon as they ſaw the fury or the power of their adverſaries diminiſh, their hopes returned, and their courage was renewed.

[*h*] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manich.* p. 61. PETRI SICULI *Hiſtoria Manich.* p. 41. GEORG. CEDRENUS *Compend. Hiſt.* p. 431. edit. Venet.

Neſtorians and Monophyſites.

III. The condition, both of the Neſtorians and Monophyſites, was much more flouriſhing under the Saracens, who were now become lords of the eaſt, than it had been hitherto under the Chriſtian emperors, or even the Perſian monarchs. Theſe two ſects met with a diſtinguiſhed protection from their new maſters, while the Greeks ſuffered under the ſame ſcepter all the rigours of perſecution and baniſhment. JESUIABAS, the ſovereign pontif of the Neſtorians, concluded a treaty firſt with MAHOMET, and afterwards with OMAR, by which he obtained many ſignal advantages for his ſect [i]. There is yet extant a *Teſtamentary Diploma* of MAHOMET, in which he promiſes and bequeaths to the Chriſtians, in his dominions, the quiet and undiſturbed enjoyment of their religion, together with their temporal advantages and poſſeſſions. Some learned men have, indeed, called in queſtion the authenticity of this deed; it is however certain, that the Mahometans unanimouſly acknowledge it to be genuine [k]. Accordingly, the ſucceſſors of MAHOMET in *Perſia* employed the Neſtorians in the moſt important affairs, both of the cabinet and of the provinces, and ſuffered the patriarch of that ſect only, to reſide in the kingdom of *Babylon* [l]. The Monophyſites enjoyed in *Syria* and *Egypt* an equal degree of favour and protection. Amrus, having made himſelf maſter of *Alexandria* in the year 644, fixed Benjamin, the pontif of the Monophyſites, in the epiſcopal reſidence of that noble city; and from this period, the Melchites [m] were without a biſhop for almoſt a whole century [n].

---

[i] JOS. SIMON. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 94.

[k] This famous *Teſtament* of MAHOMET was brought from the eaſt, during the laſt century, by PACIFICUS SCALIGER, a Capuchin monk, and was publiſhed firſt in Arabic and Latin at *Paris* by GABRIEL SIONITA, A. D. 1630; afterwards in Latin by the learned FABRICIUS, A. D. 1638; and alſo by HINCKELMAN, A. D. 1690. See HENR. HOTTINGER. *Hiſt. Orient.* lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 237. ASSEMANI *Bibl. Orient. Vat.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 95. RENAUDOT, *Hiſtor. Patriarchar. Alexandr.* p. 168. They, who in conformity with the opinion of GROTIUS, reject this Teſtament, ſuppoſe it forged by the Syrian and Arabian monks, with a view to ſoften the Mahometan yoke under which they groaned, and to render their deſpotic maſters leſs ſevere. Nor is this repreſentation of the matter at all incredible; for it is certain, that the monks of mount *Sinai* formerly ſhewed an edict of MAHOMET of the ſame nature with the one now under conſideration, which they pretend was drawn up by him while he was yet in a private ſtation. This edict was extremely advantageous to them, and was, undoubtedly, an artful piece of forgery. The fraud was plain: but the Mahometans, in conſequence of their ignorance and ſtupidity, believed it to be a genuine production of their chief, and continue ſtill in the ſame opinion. There is an account of this fraud given by CANTIMIR, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. ii. p. 269. The argument therefore which RENAUDOT and others draw in favour of the *Teſtament* in queſtion, from the acknowledgement which the Mahometans make of its authenticity, is of little or no weight; ſince the Mahometans of all others are the moſt liable to be deceived in things of this nature, by their groſs and unparalleled ignorance. On the other hand, ſeveral of the arguments uſed by thoſe, who deny the authenticity of this *Teſtament*, are equally unſatisfactory; that, particularly, which is drawn from the difference that there is between the ſtyle of this deed and that of the *Alcoran*, proves abſolutely nothing at all: ſince it is not eſſential to the genuineſs of this Teſtament to ſuppoſe it penned by MAHOMET himſelf, becauſe the impoſtor might have employed a ſecretary to compoſe it. But let this *Teſtament* be genuine or ſpurious, it is undeniably certain that its contents were true; ſince many learned men have fully proved, that MAHOMET, at his firſt ſetting out, prohibited, in the ſtrongeſt manner, the commiſſion of all ſorts of injuries againſt the Chriſtians, and eſpecially the Neſtorians.

Monothelites.

IV. Though the Greek church was already torn aſunder by the moſt lamentable diviſions, yet its calamities were far from being at an end. A new ſect aroſe, A. D. 630, under the reign of the emperor Heraclius, which, in a ſhort ſpace of time, excited ſuch violent commotions as engaged the eaſtern and weſtern churches to unite their forces in order to its extinction. The ſource of this tumult was an unſeaſonable plan of peace and union. Heraclius, conſidering, with pain, the detriment which the Grecian empire had ſuffered by the migration of the perſecuted Neſtorians, and their ſettlement in *Perſia*, was ardently deſirous of reuniting the Monophyſites to the boſom of the Greek church, leſt the empire ſhould receive a new wound by their departure from it. Purſuant to this idea, he held a conference, during the Perſian war, A. D. 622, with a certain perſon named Paul, a man of great credit and authority among the Armenian Monophyſites; and another, at *Hierapolis*, in the year 629, with Athanasius, the Catholic or biſhop of that ſect, upon the methods that ſeemed moſt proper to reſtore tranquillity and concord to a divided church. Both theſe perſons aſſured the emperor, that they who maintained the doctrine of *one nature*, might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of *Chalcedon*, and thereby to terminate their controverſy with the Greeks, provided that the latter would give their aſſent to the truth of the following propoſition, *viz. that in* Jesus Christ *there was, after the union of the two natures, but one will, and one operation.* Heraclius communicated this matter to Sergius, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who was a Syrian by birth, and whoſe parents adhered to the doctrine of the Monophyſites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that the doctrine of *one will* and *one operation* after the *union* of the *two natures*, might be ſafely adopted without the leaſt injury to truth, or the ſmalleſt detriment to the authority of the council of *Chalcedon*. In conſequence of this, the emperor publiſhed an edict, A. D. 630, in favour of that doctrine, and hoped, by this act of authority, to reſtore peace and concord both in church and ſtate [o].

The progreſs of their doctrine.

V. The firſt reception of this new project was promiſing, and things ſeemed to go on ſmoothly. For though ſome eccleſiaſtics refuſed ſubmitting to the imperial edict, yet CYRUS and ATHANASIUS, the patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, received it without heſitation; and the ſee of *Jeruſalem* was at that time vacant [*p*]. As to the Roman pontif, he was entirely overlooked in the matter, as his conſent was not conſidered as at all neceſſary in an affair that related only to the eaſtern church. In the mean time, CYRUS, who had been promoted by HERACLIUS, from the ſee of *Phaſis* to that of *Alexandria*, aſſembled a council by the ſeventh decree of which, the doctrine of Monothelitiſm, or *one will*, which the emperor had introduced by the edict already mentioned, was ſolemnly confirmed. This new modification of the doctrine of the council of *Chalcedon*, which ſeemed to bring it nearer to the Eutychian ſyſtem, had the deſired effect upon the Monothelites, and induced great numbers of them, who were diſperſed in *Egypt*, *Armenia*, and other remote provinces to return into the boſom of the church. They, however, explained the perplexed and ambiguous doctrine of *one will* in CHRIST, in a manner peculiar to themſelves, and not quite conformable to the true principles of their ſect.

---

[l] Assemani, l. c. p. 97. Eusebe Renaud. *Hiſtor. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 163. 169.

[(m) The *Melchites* were thoſe Chriſtians in *Syria*, *Egypt*, and the *Levant*, who, though not Greeks, followed the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church. They were called Melchites, *i. e.* Royaliſts, by their adverſaries, by way of reproach, on account of their implicit ſubmiſſion to the edict of the emperor Marcian, in favour of the council of *Chalcedon*.]

[n] Euseb. Renaud. *Hiſt. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 168.

[o] The authors, who have written concerning this ſect, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. x. p. 204. The account which I have here given of them is drawn from the fountain head, and is ſupported by the beſt authorities.

The oppoſition it met with.

VI. This ſmiling proſpect of peace and concord was, however, but tranſitory, and was unhappily ſucceeded by the moſt dreadful tumults excited by a monk of *Paleſtine*, whoſe name was SOPHRONIUS. This monk, being preſent at the council aſſembled at *Alexandria* by CYRUS, in the year 633, had violently oppoſed the decree, which confirmed the doctrine of *one will* in CHRIST. His oppoſition, which was then treated with contempt, became more formidable the following year; when, raiſed to the patriarchal ſee of *Jeruſalem*, he ſummoned a council, in which the Monothelites were condemned as heretics, who revived and propagated the Eutychian errors concerning the mixture and confuſion of the two natures in CHRIST. Multitudes, alarmed at the cry of hereſy raiſed by this ſeditious monk, adopted his ſentiments; but it was HONORIUS, the Roman pontif, that he laboured principally to gain over to his ſide. His efforts, however, were vain: for SERGIUS, the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, having informed HONORIUS, by a long and artful letter, of the true ſtate of the queſtion, determined that pontif in favour of the doctrine, which maintained *one will* and *one operation* in CHRIST [*q*]. Hence aroſe thoſe obſtinate conteſts which rent the church into two ſects, and the ſtate into two factions.

The conteſts occaſioned by the *Ecthęſis* and the *Type*.

VII. In order to put an end to theſe commotions, HERACLIUS iſſued out, in the year 639, the famous edict compoſed by SERGIUS, and called the

---

[*p*] See LEQUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 261.

[*q*] The Roman Catholic writers have employed all their art and induſtry to repreſent the conduct of HONORIUS in ſuch a manner, as to ſave his pretended infallibility from the charge of error in a queſtion of ſuch importance. (See, among others, HARDUIN. *De ſacramento altaris*, which is publiſhed in his *Opera Selecta*, p. 255.) And, indeed, it is eaſy to find both matter of accuſation and defence in the caſe of this pontif. On the one hand, it would appear that he himſelf knew not his own ſentiments, nor attached any preciſe and definite meaning to the expreſſions he uſed in the courſe of this controverſy. On the other hand, it is certain, that he gave it as his opinion, that in CHRIST there was but *one will* and *one operation*. It was for this that he was condemned in the council of *Conſtantinople*, and he muſt of conſequence be undoubtedly a heretic, if it is true, that general councils cannot err. See BOSSUET, in his *Defence of the Declaration made by the Gallican Clergy in the year* 1682, *concerning Eccleſiaſtical Power*, par. II. lib. xii. cap. xxi. p. 182. See alſo BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 391.

Ecthesis, or expoſition of the faith, in which all controverſies upon the queſtion, *whether in* CHRIST *there was one, or two operations*, were ſtrictly prohibited, though in the ſame edict the doctrine of *one will* was plainly inculcated. A conſiderable number of the eaſtern biſhops declared their aſſent to this new law, which was alſo ſubmiſſively received by their chief PYRRHUS, who, upon the death of SERGIUS in the year 639, was raiſed to the ſee of *Conſtantinople*. In the weſt, the caſe was quite different. JOHN, the fourth Roman pontif of that name, aſſembled a council at *Rome* A. D. 639, in which the *Ecthesis* was rejected, and the Monothelites condemned. Nor was this all: for in the progreſs of this conteſt, a new edict, known by the name of *Type* or *Formulary*, was publiſhed, in the year 648, by the emperor CONSTANS, by the advice of PAUL of *Conſtantinople* [r], by which the *Ecthesis* was ſuppreſſed, and the contending parties commanded to terminate their diſputes concerning the one will, and the one operation in CHRIST, by obſerving a profound ſilence upon that difficult and ambiguous ſubject. This ſilence, which was ſo wiſely commanded in a matter which it was impoſſible to determine to the ſatisfaction of the contending parties, appeared highly criminal to the angry and contentious monks. They, therefore, excited MARTIN, biſhop of *Rome*, to oppoſe his authority to an edict, which hindered them from propagating ſtrife and contention in the church; and their importunities had the deſired effect; for this prelate, in a council of an hundred and five biſhops, aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 649, condemned both the *Ecthesis* and the *Type*, though without any mention of the names of the emperors who had publiſhed thoſe edicts, and thundered out the moſt dreadful anathemas againſt the Monothelites and their patrons, who were ſolemnly conſigned to the devil and his angels.

The ſixth general council.

VIII. The emperor CONSTANS, juſtly irritated at theſe haughty and impudent proceedings of MARTIN, who treated the imperial laws with ſuch contempt, ordered him to be ſeized and carried into the iſle of *Naxos*, where he was kept priſoner a whole year. This order, which was followed with much cruel treatment, was executed by CALLIOPAS, exarch of *Italy*, in the year 650; and, at the ſame time, MAXIMUS, the ring-leader of the ſeditious monks, was baniſhed to *Bizyca*; and other rioters of the ſame tribe were differently puniſhed in proportion to the part they acted in this rebellion. Theſe reſolute proceedings rendered EUGENIUS and VITALIANUS, the ſucceeding biſhops of *Rome*, more moderate and prudent than their predeceſſor had been; eſpecially the latter, who received CONSTANS, upon his arrival at *Rome* in the year 663, with the higheſt marks of diſtinction and reſpect, and uſed the wiſeſt precautions to prevent the flame of that unhappy controverſy from breaking out a ſecond time. And thus, for ſeveral years, it appeared to be extinguiſhed; but it was ſo only in appearance; it was a lurking flame which ſpred itſelf ſecretly, and gave reaſon to thoſe who examined things with attention.

[(r) It is proper to obſerve here, that PAUL, who was a Monothelite in his heart, and had maintained the Ecthesis with great zeal, fell upon this prudent meaſure with a view to appeaſe the Roman pontif and the African biſhops, who were incenſed againſt him to the higheſt degree on account of his attachment to the doctrine of *one will*.]

attention to dread new combuſtions both in church and ſtate. To prevent theſe, CONSTANTINE POGONATUS, the ſon of CONSTANS, purſuant to the advice of AGATHO, the Roman pontif, ſummoned, in the year 680, the ſixth *general*, or *œcumenical council*, in which he permitted the Monothelites and pope HONORIUS himſelf to be ſolemnly condemned in preſence of the Roman legates, who repreſented AGATHO in that aſſembly, and confirmed the ſentence pronounced by the council, by the ſanction of penal laws enacted againſt ſuch as pretended to oppoſe it.

A ſhort view of the doctrine of the Monothelites.

IX. It is difficult to give a clear and accurate account of the ſentiments of thoſe who were called Monothelites; nor is it eaſy to point out the objections of their adverſaries. Neither of the contending parties expreſs themſelves conſiſtently with what ſeem to have been their reſpective opinions; and they both diſavow the errors with which they reciprocally charge each other. The following obſervations contain the cleareſt notion we can form of the ſtate of this ſubtile controverſy. 1. The Monothelites declared, that they had no connexion with the Eutychians and Monophyſites; but maintained, in oppoſition to theſe two ſects, that in CHRIST there were two diſtinct natures, which were ſo united, though without the leaſt mixture or confuſion, as to form by their union only one perſon. 2. They acknowledged that the ſoul of CHRIST was endowed with a will or faculty of volition, which it ſtill retained after its union with the divine nature. For they taught that CHRIST was not only perfect God, but alſo perfect man; from whence it followed, that his ſoul was endowed with the faculty of volition. 3. They denied that this faculty of volition in the ſoul of CHRIST was abſolutely unactive, maintaining, on the contrary, that it co-operated with the divine will. 4. They, therefore, in effect attributed to our Lord two wills, and theſe moreover operating and active. 5. They however affirmed, that, in a certain ſenſe, there was in CHRIST but one will and one manner of operation.

Different opinions among that ſect.

X. We muſt not indeed imagine, that all, who were diſtinguiſhed by the title of Monothelites, were unanimous in their ſentiments with reſpect to the points now mentioned. Some, as appears from undoubted teſtimonies, meant no more than this, that the two wills in CHRIST were *one*, i. e. in perfect harmony; that the human will was in perpetual conformity with the divine, and was, conſequently, always holy, juſt, and good; in which opinion there is nothing reprehenſible. Others, approaching nearer to the ſentiment of the Monophyſites, imagined that the two wills or faculties of volition in CHRIST were blended into one, in that which they called the *perſonal union:* acknowledging, at the ſame time, that the diſtinction between theſe two wills was perceivable by reaſon, and that it was alſo neceſſary to diſtinguiſh carefully in this matter. The greateſt part of this ſect, and thoſe who were alſo the moſt remarkable for their ſubtilty and penetration, were of opinion, that the human will of CHRIST was the inſtrument of the divine; or, in other words, never operated or acted of itſelf, but was always ruled, influenced, and impelled by the divine will, in ſuch a manner, however, that when it was once ſet in motion, it decreed and operated with the ruling principle. The doctrine of one will and one operation in CHRIST, which the Monothelites maintained with ſuch invincible obſtinacy, was a natural conſequence of this hypotheſis; ſince the operation of an inſtrument and of the being who employs it, is one ſimple operation, and not two diſtinct operations or energies. According to this view of things, the Eutychian doctrine was quite out of the queſtion; and the only point of controverſy to be determined, was, whether the human will in Christ was a ſelf-moving faculty determined by its own internal impulſe, or whether, on the contrary, it derived all its motion and operations from the divine?

In the mean time, we may learn from this controverſy, that nothing is more precarious, and nothing more dangerous and deceitful than that religious peace and concord which are founded upon ambiguous doctrines, and cemented by obſcure and equivocal propoſitions, or articles of faith. The partiſans of the council of *Chalcedon* endeavoured to enſnare the Monophyſites, by propoſing their doctrine in a manner that admitted of a double explication; and by this imprudent piece of cunning, that ſhewed ſo little reverence for the truth, they involved both church and ſtate in tedious and lamentable diviſions.

Their fate after the council of *Conſtantinople*.

XI. The doctrine of the Monothelites, condemned and exploded by the council of *Conſtantinople*, found a place of refuge among the Mardaites, a people who inhabited the mounts *Libanus* and *Antilibanus*, and who, about the concluſion of this century, were called Maronites, after Maro their firſt biſhop, a name which they ſtill retain. None of the ancient writers give any certain account of the firſt perſon who inſtructed theſe Mountaineers in the doctrine of the Monothelites; it is probable, however, from ſeveral circumſtances, that it was Jonn Maro, whoſe name they had adopted [*s*]. One thing, indeed, we know, with the utmoſt certainty, from the teſtimony of Tyrius and other unexceptionable witneſſes, as alſo from the moſt authentic records, and that is, that the Maronites retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the twelfth century, when abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of *one will* in Christ, they were re-admitted, in the year 1182, to the communion of the Roman church. The moſt learned of the modern Maronites have left no method unemployed to defend their church againſt this accuſation; they have laboured to prove by a variety of teſtimonies, that their anceſtors always perſevered in the Catholic faith, in their attachment to the Roman pontif, without ever adopting the doctrine either of the Monophyſites, or Monothelites. But all their efforts are inſufficient to prove the truth of theſe aſſertions to ſuch as have any acquaintance with the hiſtory of the church and the records of ancient times; for to all ſuch the teſtimonies they allege, will appear abſolutely fictitious and deſtitute of authority [*t*].

[*s*] This eccleſiaſtic received the name of Maro, from his having lived in the character of a monk in the famous convent of *St. Maro*, upon the borders of the *Orontes*, before his ſettlement among the Mardaites of mount *Libanus*. For an ample account of this prelate, ſee Jos. Simon. Assemani *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 496.

[*t*] The cauſe of the Maronites has been pleaded by the writers of that nation, ſuch as Abraham Echellensis, Gabriel Sionita, and others; but the moſt ample defence of heir uninterrupted orthodoxy was made by Faustus Nairon, partly in his *Diſſertatio de rigine, nomine, ac religione Marionitarum*, publiſhed at *Rome* A. D. 1679, and partly in his

The council called *Quiniſextum.*

XII. Neither the ſixth general council, in which the Monothelites were condemned, nor the fifth, which had been aſſembled in the preceding century, had determined any thing concerning eccleſiaſtical diſcipline or religious ceremonies. To ſupply this defect, a new aſſembly of biſhops was held purſuant to the order of JUSTINIAN II, in a ſpacious hall of the imperial palace called *Trullus*, i. e. *Cupola*, from the form of the building. This council, which met A. D. 692, was called *Quiniſextum*, as we had occaſion to obſerve formerly, from its being conſidered, by the Greeks, as a ſuppliment to the fifth and ſixth œcumenical councils, and as having given to the acts of theſe aſſemblies the degree of perfection which they had hitherto wanted. There are yet extant an hundred and two laws which were enacted in this council, and which related to the external celebration of divine worſhip, the government of the church, and the lives and manners of Chriſtians. Of theſe there are ſix, which are diametrically oppoſite to ſeveral opinions and rites of the Romiſh church; for which reaſon the Roman pontifs have refuſed to adopt, without reſtriction, the deciſions of this council, or to reckon it in the number of thoſe called *œcumenical*, though they look upon the greateſt part of its decrees as worthy of applauſe [*u*].

Euoplia fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum et Chaldæorum monumentis, publiſhed in the ſame city A. D. 1624. None of the learned, however, were perſuaded by his arguments except PAGI * and LA ROCQUE, of whom the latter has given us, in his *Voyage de Syrie et de Montliban*, tom. ii. p. 28—128, a long diſſertation concerning the origin of the Maronites. Even the learned ASSEMANUS himſelf, a Maronite, and who has ſpared no pains to defend his nation † againſt the reproach in queſtion, acknowledges ingenuouſly, that among the arguments, uſed by NAIRON and others in favour of the Maronites, there are a great many deſtitute of force. See Jo. MORINUS, *De Ordinat. Sacris*, p. 380. RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire Critique des Chretiens Orientaux*, chap. xiii. p. 146, EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hiſtoria Patriarchar. Alexandrinor*. p. 149. and *Præf. ad Liturgias Orientales*. LE BRUN, *Explication de la Meſſe*, tom. ii. p. 626. *Pariſ.* 1726. The arguments of the contending parties are enumerated impartially in ſuch a manner, as leaves the deciſion to the reader, by LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. iii. p. 10.

[*u*] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. i. p. 486. CHRIST. LUPUS, *Diſſertat. de Concilio Trullano in Notis et Diſſertat. ad Concilia*, tom. iii. Opp. p. 168. The Roman Catholics reject the following deciſions of this council: 1. The fifth *canon*, which approves of the eighty-five apoſtolical canons, commonly attributed to CLEMENT. 2. The thirteenth *canon*, which allows the prieſts to marry. 3. The fifty-fifth *canon*, which condemns the Sabbath-faſt, that was an inſtitution of the Latin church. 4. The ſixty-ſeventh *canon*, which preſcribes the moſt rigorous abſtinence from blood and things ſtrangled. 5. The eighty-ſecond *canon*, which prohibits the repreſenting CHRIST under the image of a lamb. 6. The thirty-ſixth *canon*, concerning the equal rank and authority of the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*.

* See *Critica Baroniana ad A.* 694.

† See *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 496.

A
COMPENDIOUS VIEW
OF
Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

BOOK THE THIRD.

CONTAINING THE
HISTORY of the CHURCH,
FROM
CHARLEMAGNE
TO
THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

THE
EIGHTH CENTURY.

PART I.
The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.
Concerning the proſperous events, which happened to the church during this century.

Cent. VIII.

The goſpel propagated in *Hyrcania* and *Tartary.*

I. WHILE the Mahometans were infeſting with their arms, and adding to their conqueſts the moſt flouriſhing provinces of *Aſia*, and obſcuring, as far as their influence could extend, the luſtre and glory of the riſing church, the Neſtorians of *Chaldea* were carrying the lamp of Chriſtianity among thoſe barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, independent on the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount *Imaus* [a]. It is now well known, that TIMOTHEUS, the Neſtorian pontif, who had been raiſed to that dignity A. D. 778, converted to the Chriſtian faith, by the miniſtry of SUBCHAL JESU, whom he had conſecrated biſhop, firſt the Gelæ and Dailamites, by whom a part of *Hyrcania* was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other miſſionaries, the reſt of the nations, who had formed ſettlements in *Hyrcania*, *Bactria*, *Margiana*, and *Sogdia* [b]. It is alſo certain, that Chriſtianity enjoyed in theſe vaſt regions, notwithſtanding the violent attacks of the Mahometans to which it was ſometimes expoſed, the advantages of a

---

[(a) The ſouthern regions of *Scythia* were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely, *Scythia within*, and *Scythia beyond Imaus*, and *Sarmatia*. It is of the firſt of theſe three that Dr. MOSHEIM ſpeaks as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the goſpel, and it comprehended *Turkeſtan* and *Mongal*, the *Uſbek* or *Zagatai*, *Kalmuc* and *Nogaian Tartary*, which were peopled by the Bactrians, Sogdians, Gandari, Sacs, and Maſſagetes, not to mention the land of *Siberia*, *Samoiedes*, and *Nova Zembla*, which were uninhabited in ancient times.]

[b] THOMAS MARGENSIS, *Hiſtoriæ Monaſticæ* lib. iii. *in* JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Bibliotheca Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 491. See alſo this latter work, tom. iii. part. II. cap. ix. § 5. p. 478.

firm and ſolid eſtabliſhment for a long courſe of ages; while the biſhops, by whoſe miniſtry it was propagated and ſupported, were all conſecrated by the ſole authority of the Neſtorian pontif.

The Germans converted by Boniface.

II. If we turn our eyes towards Europe, we find many nations that were as yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the goſpel. Almoſt all the Germans (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Chriſtianity under THEODORIC, or THIERRY, the ſon of CLOVIS, and the eaſtern Franks, with a few other provinces) lay buried in the groſſeſt darkneſs of Pagan ſuperſtition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuſe the truth into the minds of theſe ſavage Germans; and various efforts were uſed for the ſame purpoſe by kings and princes, whoſe intereſt it was to propagate a religion that was ſo adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of theſe warlike nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with ſucceſs. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the miniſtry of WINFRID, a Benedictine monk, born in *England* of illuſtrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of BONIFACE. This famous eccleſiaſtic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, paſſed over into *Frieſland*, A. D. 715, to preach the goſpel to the people of that country, but this firſt attempt was unſucceſsful; and a war breaking out between RADBOD, the king of that country, and CHARLES MARTEL, our zealous miſſionary returned to *England*. He reſumed, however, his pious undertaking in the year 719; and being ſolemnly impowered, by the Roman pontif GREGORY II, to preach the goſpel not only in *Frieſland*, but all over *Germany*, he performed the functions of a Chriſtian teacher among the Thuringians, Frieſlanders, and Heſſians with conſiderable ſucceſs [c].

Other pious exploits of this famous miſſionary, and his advancement in the church.

III. This eminent miſſionary was, in the year 723, conſecrated biſhop by GREGORY II, who changed the name of WINFRID into that of BONIFACE; ſeconded alſo by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of CHARLES MARTEL, mayor of the palace to CHILPERIC king of *France*, he reſumed his miniſterial labours among the Heſſians and Thuringians, and finiſhed, with glory, the taſk he had undertaken, in which he received conſiderable aſſiſtance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from *England* and *France*. As the Chriſtian churches erected by BONIFACE were too numerous to be governed by one biſhop, this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbiſhop, in the year 738, by GREGORY III, by whoſe authority, and the auſpicious protection of CARLOMAN and PEPIN, the ſons of CHARLES MARTEL, he founded, in *Germany*, the biſhopricks of *Wurtzbourg*, *Burabourg*, *Erfurt*, and *Aichſtadt*: to which he added, in the year 744, the famous monaſtery of *Fulda*. His laſt promotion, and the laſt recompenſe of his aſſiduous labours in the propagation of the truth, was his advancement to the archiepiſcopal ſee of *Mentz* A. D. 746, by ZACHARY, biſhop of *Rome*, by whom he was, at the ſame time, created primate of

---

[c] An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned diſſertation of GUDENIUS, *De S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apoſtolo*, publiſhed in 4to at *Helmſtad* in the year 1722. See alſo JO. AL. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 709. *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 92. MABILLON, *in Annalibus Benedictinis*, &c.

Germany and *Belgium*. In his old age, he returned again to *Frieſland*, that he might finiſh his miniſtry in the ſame place where he had entered firſt upon its functions: but his piety was illrewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered in the year 755, while fifty eccleſiaſtics, who accompanied him in this voyage, ſhared the ſame unhappy fate.

The judgment we are to form concerning the apoſtleſhip of Boniface.

IV. **Boniface**, on account of his miniſterial labours and holy exploits, was diſtinguiſhed by the honourable title of the *Apoſtle of the Germans*; nor, if we conſider impartially the eminent ſervices he rendered to Chriſtianity, will this title appear to have been undeſervedly beſtowed. But it is neceſſary to obſerve, that this eminent prelate was an apoſtle of modern faſhion, and had, in many reſpects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and miniſtry of the primitive and true apoſtles. Beſides his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman pontif, which equalled, if it did not ſurpaſs his zeal for the ſervice of Christ, and the propagation of his religion [*d*], many other things unworthy of a truly Chriſtian miniſter are laid to his charge. In combating the Pagan ſuperſtitions, he did not always uſe thoſe arms, with which the ancient heralds of the goſpel gained ſuch victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and ſometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Chriſtians. His *epiſtles*, moreover, diſcover an imperious and arrogant temper; a cunning and inſidious turn of mind; an exceſſive zeal for increaſing the honours and pretenſions of the ſacerdotal order; and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was abſolutely neceſſary in an apoſtle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Chriſtian religion.

Other apoſtles preach the goſpel to the Germans.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now ſpeaking, was not the only Chriſtian miniſter, who attempted to deliver the *German* nations from the miſerable bondage of Pagan ſuperſtition; ſeveral others ſignalized their zeal in the ſame laudable and pious undertaking. **Corbinian**, a French Benedictine monk, after having laboured with vaſt aſſiduity and fervour in planting the goſpel among the Bavarians, and other countries, became biſhop of *Freiſingen* [*e*]. **Firmin**, a Gaul by birth, preached the goſpel under various kinds of ſuffering and oppoſition in *Alſatia*, *Bavaria*, and *Helvetia*, now *Switzerland*, and had inſpection over a conſiderable number of monaſteries [*f*]. **Lebuin**, an Engliſhman, laboured with the moſt ardent zeal and aſſiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons; and alſo the Frieſlanders, Belgæ, and other nations to receive the light of Chriſtianity, but his miniſtry was attended with very little fruit [*g*]. We paſs over in ſilence ſeveral apoſtles of leſs fame;

---

[d] The French Benedictine monks ingenuouſly confeſs that Boniface was an over zealous partiſan of the Roman pontif, and attributed more authority to him than was juſt and fitting. Their words, in their *Hiſtoire Litteraize de la France*, tom. iv. p. 106. are as follows: "Il exprime ſon devouement pour le S. Siege en des termes qui ne ſont pas aſſéz proportionés à la dignité du Caractere epiſcopal."

[e] Baronius, *Annal. Eccleſ.* tom. viii. *ad An.* dccxvi. § 10. Car. Maichelbeck, *Hiſtoriæ Friſingenſis* tom. i.

[f] Herm. Bruschii *Chronologia Monaſter. German.* p. 30. Anton. Pagi *Critica in Annales Baronii*, tom. ii. *ad An.* dcclix. § 9. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 124.

[g] Hucbaldi *Vita S.* Lebuini *in* Laur. Surii *Vitis Sanctor.* d. 12. Nov. p. 277. Jo. Molleii *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 464.

nor is it neceſſary to mention WILLIBRORD, and others of ſuperior reputation, who perſiſted now with great alacrity and conſtancy in the labours they had undertaken, in the preceding century, in order to the propagation of divine truth.

The expedition of Charlemagne againſt the Saxons.

VI. A war broke out, at this time, between CHARLEMAGNE and the Saxons, which contributed much to the propagation of Chriſtianity, though not by the force of a rational perſuaſion. The Saxons were, at this time, a numerous and formidable people, who inhabited a conſiderable part of *Germany*, and were engaged in perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their boundaries, and other matters of complaint. Hence CHARLEMAGNE turned his arms againſt this powerful nation, A. D. 772, with a deſign, not only to ſubdue that ſpirit of revolt, with which they had ſo often troubled the empire, but alſo to aboliſh their idolatrous worſhip, and engage them to embrace the Chriſtian religion. He hoped, by their converſion, to vanquiſh their obſtinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the goſpel would aſſwage their impetuous and reſtleſs paſſions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to ſubmit more tamely to the government of the Franks. Theſe projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the firſt attempt to convert the Saxons, after having ſubdued them, was unſucceſsful, becauſe it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the biſhops and monks, whom the victor had left among that conquered people, whoſe obſtinate attachment to idolatry no arguments nor exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards uſed to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which CHARLEMAGNE carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, againſt that valiant people, whoſe love of liberty was exceſſive, and whoſe averſion to the reſtraints of ſacerdotal authority was inexpreſſible [*b*]. During theſe wars, their attachment to the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors was ſo warmly combatted by the allurements of reward, by the terror of puniſhment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they ſuffered themſelves to be baptized, though with inward reluctance, by the miſſionaries, which the emperor ſent among them for that purpoſe [*i*]. Theſe ſeditions, indeed, were ſoon after renewed, and fomented by **Widekind** and **Albion**, two of the moſt valiant among the Saxon chiefs, who attempted to aboliſh the Chriſtian worſhip by the ſame violent methods which had contributed to its eſtabliſhment. But the courage and liberality of **Charlemagne**, alternately employed to ſuppreſs this new rebellion, engaged theſe chiefs to make a public and ſolemn profeſſion of Chriſtianity, in the year 785, and to promiſe an adherence to that divine religion for the reſt of their days [k]. To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion, which they had embraced with reluctance, ſeveral biſhops were appointed to reſide among them, ſchools alſo were erected, and monaſteries founded, that the means of inſtruction might not be wanting. The ſame precautions were employed among the Huns in *Pannonia*, to maintain in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity that fierce people, whom **Charlemagne** had converted to the faith, when, exhauſted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head againſt his victorious arms, and choſe rather to be *Chriſtians* than *ſlaves* [l].

[*b*] It will be proper here to tranſcribe, from the epiſtles of the famous ALCUIN, once abbot of *Canterbury*, a remarkable paſſage, which will ſhew us the reaſons which contributed principally to give the Saxons an averſion to Chriſtianity, and, at the ſame time, expoſe the abſurd and prepoſterous manner of teaching uſed by the miſſionaries, who were ſent to convert them. This paſſage, in the CIV *epiſtle*, and the 1647th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta inſtantia leve CHRISTI jugum et onus ejus leve duriſſimo Saxonum populo prædicaretur, quanta Decimarum redditi vel legalis pro parviſſimis quibuſlibet culpis edictis neceſſitas exigebatur, forte baptiſmatis ſacramenta non abhorrerent. Sint tandem aliquando DOCTORES FIDEI APOSTOLICIS ERUDITI EXEMPLIS; ſint PRÆDICATORES NON PRÆDATORES" Here the reader may ſee a lively picture of the kind of apoſtles that flouriſhed at this time; apoſtles who were more zealous in exacting *tithes*, and extending their authority, than in propagating the ſublime truths, and precepts of the goſpel. And yet theſe very apoſtles are ſaid to have wrought ſtupendous miracles.

[*i*] ALCUINUS apud WILHELMUM MALMESBUR. *De geſtis regum Anglorum*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23. inter *Rerum Anglicar. Scriptores, Francofurti* A. D. 1601. editos. In this work we find the following paſſage, which proves what we have ſaid with reſpect to the unworthy methods that were uſed in converting the Saxons: "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Freſonum populi, inſtante Rege CAROLO, alios PRÆMIIS et alios MINIS ſollicitantes ad fidem CHRISTI converſi ſunt."

The judgment we ought to form of the converſions made by Charlemagne.

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful ſenſe of the famous exploits which **Charlemagne** had performed in the ſervice of Chriſtianity, canoniſed his memory, and turned this bloody *warrior* into an eminent *ſaint*. In the twelfth century, **Frederic I**, emperor of the Romans, ordered **Paschal II**, whom he had raiſed to the pontificate, to enroll the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary ſaints of the church [m]. And, indeed, **Charlemagne** merited this honour according to the opinions which generally prevailed at that period of time; for to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations [n], and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, was then conſidered as the higheſt merit, and as a ſufficient pretenſion to the honour of *ſaintſhip*. But in the eſteem of

---

See alſo two paſſages in the *Capitularia Regum Francor.* tom. i p. 246 and 252. From the firſt of theſe paſſages we learn that thoſe of the Saxons, who abandoned the Pagan ſuperſtitions, were "reſtored to the liberty they had forfeited by the fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tribute;" and in the ſecond, we find the following ſevere law, that "every Saxon, who contemptuouſly refuſed to receive the ſacrament of baptiſm, and perſiſted in his adherence to Paganiſm, was to be puniſhed with death." While ſuch rewards and puniſhments were employed in the cauſe of religion, there was no occaſion for miracles to advance its progreſs, for theſe motives were ſufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profeſſion of the goſpel; but it is eaſy to imagine what ſort of Chriſtians the Saxons muſt have been, who were dragooned into the church in this abominable manner. Compare with the authors mentioned in this note, **Launoius**, *De veteri more baptizandi Judæos et Infideles*, cap. v, vi. p. 703. tom. ii. Opp. part. II. This author aſſures us, that **Adrian**, the firſt Roman pontif of that name, honoured with his approbation **Charlemagne**'s method of converting the Saxons.

[k] **Eginartus**, *De vita Caroli M.* **Adam Bremensis**, lib. i. cap. viii. See alſo the writers of the hiſtory and exploits of **Charlemagne**, which are mentioned by **Jo. Alb. Fabricius**, in his *Bibliotheca Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 959.

[l] *Vita S. Rudberti in* **Henric. Canisii** *Lectionibus Antiquis*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 340. **Pauli Debreceni** *Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Reformat. in Hungar. et Tranſilvania a* **Lampio** *edita*, part. I. cap. ii. p. 10.

[m] Vid. **Henr. Canisii** *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 207. **Walchii** *Diſſert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione.*

[n] Vid. **Caroli** *Teſtamentum in* **Steph. Baluzii** *Capitularibus Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 487.

thoſe, who judge of the nature and characters of *ſanctity* by the deciſions of the goſpel upon that head, the *ſainted* emperor will appear utterly unworthy of that ghoſtly dignity. For, not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, whoſe number counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the converſion of the Huns, Frieſlanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the ſuggeſtions of ambition, than by a principle of true piety; and that his main view in theſe religious exploits was to ſubdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them to his yoke which they ſupported with impatience, and ſhook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boaſted ſaint made no ſcruple of ſeeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to cruſh the Greeks, notwithſtanding their profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion [o].

And of the miracles which are ſaid to have been performed in this century.

VIII. The many and ſtupendous miracles, which are ſaid to have been wrought by the Chriſtian miſſionaries, who were ſent to convert the barbarous nations, have loſt, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages. The corrupt diſcipline that then prevailed admitted of thoſe fallacious ſtratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the goſpel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, by fictitious prodigies, thoſe obdurate hearts, which they could not ſubdue by reaſon and argument. It is not, however, to be ſuppoſed, that all thoſe, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical ſpecies of artifice and fraud. For as, on the one hand, thoſe ignorant and ſuperſtitious nations were diſpoſed to look upon, as miraculous, every event, which had an unuſual aſpect; ſo, on the other, the Chriſtian doctors themſelves were ſo uninſtructed and ſuperficial, ſo little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connexions of things in their ordinary courſe, that uncommon events, however natural, were conſidered by them as miraculous interpoſitions of the moſt high. This will appear obvious to ſuch as, void of ſuperſtition and partiality, read the *Acts of the ſaints*, who flouriſhed in this and the following centuries.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events, which happened to the church during this century.

The Saracens become maſters in the eaſt.

I. THE eaſtern empire had now fallen from its former ſtrength and grandeur, through the repeated ſhocks of dreadful revolutions, and the conſuming power of inteſtine calamities. The throne was now become the ſeat of terror, inquietude, and ſuſpicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and ſent into baniſhment. Under LEO, the Iſaurian, and his ſon CONSTANTINE, ſurnamed COPRONYMUS, aroſe that fatal controverſy about the worſhip of images; which proved a ſource of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almoſt incredibly, the force of the empire. Theſe troubles and diſſenſions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of *Aſia* and *Africa*, to oppreſs the Greeks in the moſt barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all ſides; as alſo to oppoſe every where the progreſs of Chriſtianity, and, in ſome places, to extirpate it entirely. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for about the middle of this century, they were aſſailed by new enemies ſtill more fierce and inhuman than thoſe whoſe uſurpations they had hitherto ſuffered. Theſe were the Turks, a tribe of the Tartars, or, at leaſt, their deſcendants, who breaking forth from the inacceſſible wilds about mount *Caucaſus*, overſpred *Colchis*, *Iberia*, and *Albania*, ruſhed from thence into *Armenia*; and, after having ſubdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms againſt the Greeks, whom, in proceſs of time, they reduced under their dominion.

---

[o] See BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Juifs*, tom. ix. cap. ii. p. 40.

The incurſion of the Turks.

Their progreſs in the weſt.

II. In the year 714, the Saracens croſſed the ſea, which ſeparates *Spain* from *Africa*, diſperſed the army of RODERIC king of the Spaniſh Goths [*p*], whoſe defeat was principally due to the treachery of their general JULIAN, and made themſelves maſters of the greateſt part of the territories of this vanquiſhed prince. About the ſame time the empire of the Viſigoths, which had ſubſiſted in *Spain* above three hundred years, was totally overturned by theſe fierce and ſavage invaders, who alſo took poſſeſſion of all the maritime coaſts of *Gaul* from the Pyrenean mountains to the river *Rhone*, from whence they made frequent excurſions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and ſword.

The rapid progreſs of theſe bold invaders was, indeed, checked by CHARLES MARTEL, who gained a ſignal victory over them in a bloody action near the city of *Poitiers*, A. D. 732 [*q*]. But the vanquiſhed ſpoilers ſoon recovered their ſtrength and their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devaſtations. This engaged CHARLEMAGNE to lead a formidable army into *Spain*, with a deſign to deliver that whole country from the oppreſſive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprize, though it did not entirely miſcarry, was not, however, attended with the ſignal ſucceſs that was expected from it [*r*]. The inroads of this warlike people were felt by many of the weſtern provinces, beſides thoſe of *France* and *Spain*. Several parts of *Italy* ſuffered from their incurſions; the iſland of *Sardinia* was reduced under their yoke; and *Sicily* was ravaged and oppreſſed by them in the moſt inhuman manner. Hence the Chriſtian religion in *Spain* and *Sardinia* ſuffered inexpreſſibly under theſe violent uſurpers.

[*p*] JO. MARIANA, *Rerum Hiſpanicarum*, lib. vi. cap. xxi. EUSEBE RENAUDOT. *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 253. Jo. de FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire de l'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 425.

[*q*] PAULUS DIACONUS, *De geſtis Longobard.* lib. vi. cap. xlvi. liii. JO. MARIANA, *Rerum. Hiſpan.* lib. vii. cap. iii. BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article ABDERAMUS. FERRERAS, *Hiſt. d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 463.

[*r*] HENR. de BUNAU, *Teutſche Kayſer-und Reich's-Hiſtorie*, tom. ii. p. 392. FERRERAS, *Hiſt. d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 506.

CENT. VIII. In *Germany*, and the adjacent countries, the Chriſtians were aſſailed by another ſort of enemies; for all ſuch as adhered to the Pagan ſuperſtitions beheld them with the moſt inveterate hatred, and perſecuted them with the moſt unrelenting violence and fury [s]. Hence, in ſeveral places, caſtles and fortreſſes were erected to reſtrain the incurſions of theſe Barbarian zealots.

---

[s] SERVATI LUPI *vita Wigberti*, p. 304.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. THERE were not wanting among the Greeks men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature; but their zeal was damped by the tumults and deſolations that reigned in the empire, and while both church and ſtate were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left deſtitute of that protection which gives both vigour and ſucceſs to the culture of the arts and ſciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were at all famous either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the ſtudy of philoſophy, and the inveſtigation of truth. Frigid homilies, inſipid narrations of the exploits of pretended ſaints, vain and ſubtile diſputes about uneſſential and trivial ſubjects, vehement and bombaſtic declamations for or againſt the erection and worſhip of images, hiſtories compoſed without method or judgment; ſuch were monuments of Grecian learning in this miſerable age.

The progreſs of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy.

II. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that the Ariſtotelian philoſophy was taught every where in the public ſchools, and was propagated in all places with conſiderable ſucceſs. The doctrine of PLATO had loſt all its credit in the ſchools, after the repeated ſentences of condemnation that had been paſſed upon the opinions of ORIGEN, and the troubles which the Neſtorian and Eutychian controverſies had excited in the church; ſo that platoniſm now was almoſt confined to the ſolitary retreats of the monaſtic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illuſtration and progreſs of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, the moſt eminent was JOHN DAMASCENUS, who compoſed a conciſe, plain, and comprehenſive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the inſtruction of the more ignorant, and, in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in *Greece* and *Syria*, to the ſtudy of that philoſophy, whoſe proſelytes increaſed daily. The Neſtorians and Jacobites were alſo extremely diligent in the ſtudy of ARISTOTLE's writings, from whence they armed themſelves with ſophiſms and quibbles, which they employed againſt the Greeks in the controverſy concerning the natures and perſon of CHRIST.

The revival of learning among the Latins by Charlemagne.

III. The literary hiſtory of the Latins exhibits innumerable inſtances of the groſſeſt ignorance [a], which will not, however, appear ſurprizing to ſuch, as conſider, with attention, the ſtate of *Europe* in this century. If we except ſome poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at *Rome* and in certain cities of *Italy* [*b*], the ſciences ſeemed to have abandoned the continent, and to have fixed their reſidence in *Britain* and *Ireland* [*c*]. Thoſe, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were diſtinguiſhed by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians excepted) either Britiſh or Scotch, ſuch as ALCUIN, BEDE, EGBERT, CLEMENS, DUNGALLUS, ACCA, and others. CHARLEMAGNE, whoſe political talents were embelliſhed by a conſiderable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal for the culture of the ſciences, endeavoured to diſpel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counſels of ALCUIN. With this view he drew firſt from *Italy*, and afterwards from *Britain* and *Ireland*, by his liberality, eminent men, who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the various branches of literature; and excited the ſeveral orders of the clergy and monks by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the purſuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

---

[a] Vid. STEPH. BALUZ. *Obſervat. ad Reginonem Prumienſem*, p. 540.

Cathedral and monaſtic ſchools erected.

IV. In the proſecution of this noble deſign, the greateſt part of the biſhops erected, by the expreſs order of the emperor, cathedral ſchools (ſo called from their lying contiguous to the principal church in each dioceſe) in which the youth, which were ſet apart for the ſervice of CHRIST, received a learned and religious education. Thoſe alſo of the abbots, who had any zeal for the cauſe of Chriſtianity, opened ſchools in their monaſteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity inſtructed ſuch as were deſigned for the monaſtic ſtate, or the ſacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning ſuitable to their future deſtination. It was formerly believed, that the univerſity of *Paris* was erected by CHARLEMAGNE; but this opinion is rejected by ſuch as have ſtudied, with impartiality, the hiſtory of this age; though it is undeniably evident that this great prince had the honour of laying, in ſome meaſure, the foundation of that noble inſtitution, and that the beginnings from which it aroſe were owing entirely to him [*d*]. Be that as it may, the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was, undoubtedly, very great, and manifeſted its ardor by a conſiderable number of excellent eſtabliſhments; nor among others muſt we paſs in ſilence the famous *Palatine* ſchool, which he erected with a view to baniſh ignorance from his court; and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the moſt learned and illuſtrious maſters of the times [*e*].

But not attended with the deſired ſucceſs.

V. Theſe excellent eſtabliſhments were not, however, attended with the deſired ſucceſs; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was beſtowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear ſurprizing, when we conſider that the moſt learned and renowned maſters of theſe times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their ſyſtem of erudition and philoſophy was nothing more than a lean and ghaſtly ſkeleton equally unfit for ornament and uſe. The whole circle of ſciences was compoſed of, what they called, the ſeven liberal arts, *viz.* grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, muſic, geometry, and aſtronomy [*f*]; the three former of which they diſtinguiſhed by the title of *trivium*, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium.* Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which theſe ſciences were taught, as we may eaſily perceive from ALCUIN's treatiſe concerning them [*g*]; and the diſſertations of St. AUGUSTIN on the ſame ſubject, which were in the higheſt repute at this time. In the greateſt part of the ſchools, the public teachers ventured no further than the *trivium*, and confined their inſtructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic: they, however, who, after paſſing the *trivium*, and alſo the *quadrivium*, were deſirous of riſing yet higher in their literary purſuits, were exhorted to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of CASSIODORE and BOETHIUS, as if the progreſs of human knowledge was bounded by the diſcoveries of thoſe two learned writers.

[*b*] LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiq. Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 811.

[*c*] JAC. USSERIUS, *Præf. ad Syllogen Epiſtolarum Hibernicarum*.

[*d*] The reaſons that have been uſed, to prove CHARLEMAGNE the founder of the univerſity of *Paris*, are accurately collected in DU BOULAY *Hiſtoria Academiæ Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 91. But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, *viz.* MABILLON, *Act. Sanct. Ord. Benedict.* tom. v. *Præf.* § 181, 182. LAUNOY. CLAUD. JOLY, *De ſcholis.*

[*e*] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 281. MABILLON, l. c. § 179.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The vices of the clergy.

I. THAT corruption of manners, which diſhonoured the clergy in the former century, increaſed, inſtead of diminiſhing, in this, and diſcovered itſelf under the moſt odious characters, both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. In the eaſt there aroſe among the moſt violent diſſenſions and quarrels among the biſhops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their ſtations, and the cauſe of CHRIST in which they were engaged, threw the ſtate into combuſtion by their outrageous clamours, and their ſcandalous diviſions; and even went ſo far as to embrue their hands in the blood of their brethren who differed from them in opinion. In the weſtern world, Chriſtianity was not leſs diſgraced by the lives and actions of thoſe who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been ſo in reality by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themſelves to their paſſions without moderation or reſtraint; they were diſtinguiſhed by their luxury, their gluttony, and their luſt; they gave themſelves up to diſſipations of various kinds, to the pleaſures of hunting, and, what was ſtill more remote from their ſacred character, to military ſtudies and enterprizes [*b*]. They had alſo ſo far extinguiſhed every principle of fear and ſhame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted againſt their vices by CARLOMAN, PEPIN, and CHARLEMAGNE at all contribute to ſet bounds to their licentiouſneſs, or to bring about their reformation [*i*].

[*f*] HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ, Diſſ.* iii p. 80. JAC. THOMASII *Programmata*, p. 368. *Obſervation. Halenſium*, tom. vi. *Obſerv.* xiv. p. 118.

[*g*] ALCUINI *Opera*, part. ii. p. 1245. edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the treatiſe of ALCUIN here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is alſo almoſt entirely tranſcribed from CASSIODORE.

The veneration in which the clergy were held in the weſt.

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithſtanding the ſhocking nature of ſuch vices, eſpecially in a ſet of men whoſe profeſſion obliged them to diſplay to the world the attracting luſtre of virtuous example; and notwithſtanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which theſe vices occaſioned; the clergy were ſtill held, corrupt as they were, in the higheſt veneration, and were honoured, as a ſort of deities, by the ſubmiſſive multitude. This veneration for the biſhops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the weſt than in the eaſtern provinces; and the reaſons of this difference will appear manifeſt to ſuch as conſider the cuſtoms and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, maſters of *Europe*, before their converſion to Chriſtianity. All theſe nations, during their continuance under the darkneſs of paganiſm, were abſolutely enſlaved to their prieſts, without whoſe counſel and authority they tranſacted nothing of the leaſt importance, either in civil or military affairs [*k*]. Upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, they, therefore, thought proper to transfer to the miniſters of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their former prieſts: and the Chriſtian biſhops, in their turn, were not only ready to accept the offer, but uſed all their diligence and dexterity to ſecure and aſſert to themſelves, and their ſucceſſors, the dominion and authority which the miniſters of paganiſm had uſurped over an ignorant and brutiſh people.

[*b*] STEPH. BALUZIUS, *ad Reginon. Prumienſem*, p. 563. WILKINS's *Concilia Magnæ Britaniæ*, tom. i. p. 90.

[*i*] STEPH. BALUZ. *Capitular. Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 189. 208. 275. 493, &c.

[*k*] JULIUS CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. v. c. 13. “ Druides magno ſunt apud eos honore: “ nam fere de omnibus controverſiis, publicis privatiſque conſtituunt; et, ſi quod eſt admiſſum “ facinus, ſi cædes facta, ſi de hæreditate, ſi de finibus controverſia eſt, iidem decernunt, præ- “ mia, pœnaſque conſtituunt: ſi qui aut privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non ſtetit, ſacrificiis “ interdicunt — Druides a bello abeſſe conſueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt: “ militiæ vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et ſua “ ſponte multi in diſciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquiſque mittuntur.” TACITUS (*De mor. Germanorum*, cap. vii. p. 384. edit. Gronov.) expreſſes alſo the power and authority of the prieſts or Druids in the following terms: “ Neque enim animadvertere, neque vincire, “ neque verberare quidem, niſi ſacerdotibus permiſſum, non quaſi in pœnam, nec ducis juſſu, “ ſed velut Deo imperante.” And again, cap. ii. “ Silentium per ſacerdotes, quibus et tum “ coërcendi jus eſt, imperatur.” HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Slavorum*, lib. i. cap. xxxvi. p. 90. expreſſes himſelf to the ſame purpoſe, “ Major Flaminis, quam Regis, apud ipſos veneratio eſt.” And again, lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 235. “ Rex apud eos modicæ æſtimationis eſt comparatione “ Flaminis. Ille enim reſponſa perquirit — Rex et populus ad illius nutum pendent.” This ancient cuſtom of honouring their prieſts, and ſubmitting, in all things, to their deciſions, was ſtill preſerved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their converſion to Chriſtianity: and this furniſhes a ſatisfactory anſwer to that queſtion, *viz.* How it came to paſs, that the Chriſtian prieſthood obtained in the weſt that enormous degree of authority, which is ſo contrary to the poſitive precepts of CHRIST, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

Their riches increaſed, and their privileges multiplied.

III. The honours and privileges which the weſtern nations had voluntarily conferred upon the biſhops, and other doctors of the church, were now augmented with new and immenſe acceſſions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the churches and monaſteries, and the revenues of the biſhops, were hitherto conſiderable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increaſing its wealth through ſucceeding ages. An opinion prevailed univerſally at this time, though its firſt authors are not known, that the puniſhment which the righteous judge of the world has reſerved for the tranſgreſſions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled, by liberal donations to God, to the ſaints, to the churches and clergy. In conſequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally ſpeaking, the moſt remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance, or acquired, by rapine, rich donations to departed ſaints, their miniſters upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected in their honour, in order to avoid the ſufferings and penalties annexed by the prieſts to tranſgreſſion in this life [*l*], and to eſcape the miſery denounced againſt the wicked in a future ſtate. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principal ſource of thoſe immenſe treaſures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monaſteries, and continued to enrich them through ſucceeding ages down to the preſent time [*m*].

They are inveſted with principalities and royal domains.

IV. But here it is highly worthy of obſervation, that the donations which princes and perſons of the firſt rank preſented, in order to make expiation for their ſins, and to ſatisfy the juſtice of God, and the demands of the clergy, did not only conſiſt in thoſe *private* poſſeſſions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; no: theſe donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with ſeveral of thoſe *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and ſovereign ſtates, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes ſignalized their ſuperſtitious veneration for the clergy, by inveſting biſhops, churches, and monaſteries in the poſſeſſion of whole provinces, cities, caſtles, and fortreſſes, with all the rights and prerogatives of ſovereignty that were annexed to them under the dominion of their former maſters. Hence it came to paſs that they, who, by their holy profeſſion, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to inſpire into the minds of men, by their inſtructions and their example, a noble contempt of ſublunary things; became, themſelves, ſcandalous ſpectacles of wordly pomp, ambition, and ſplendor, were created *dukes*, *counts*, and *marquiſes*, judges, legiſlators, and ſovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but alſo, upon many occaſions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raiſing. It is here that we are to look for the ſource of thoſe dreadful tumults and calamities, that ſpred deſolation through *Europe* in after times, particularly of thoſe bloody wars concerning *inveſtitures*, and thoſe obſtinate contentions and diſputes about the *regalia*.

[*l*] The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous faſts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of ſaints and martyrs, and ſuch like auſterities. Theſe were the penalties, which the prieſts impoſed upon ſuch as had confeſſed their crimes; and as they were ſingularly grievous to thoſe who had led voluptuous lives, and were deſirous of continuing in the ſame courſe of licentious pleaſure, effeminacy, and eaſe; the richer ſort of tranſgreſſors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their ſubſtance to avoid ſuch ſevere and rigorous penalties.

[*m*] Hence, by a known form of ſpeech, they, who offered donations to the church or clergy, were ſaid to do this for *the redemption of their ſoul*; and the gifts themſelves were generally called *the price of tranſgreſſion*. See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Diſſ. de Redemptione Peccatorum*, in his *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 712.

The cauſes of this exceſſive liberality to the clergy.

V. The exceſſive donations that were made to the clergy, and that extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treaſures of the European churches (to which theſe donations and this liberality were totally confined) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. From hence we may conclude, that theſe donations were owing to cuſtoms peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy that were eſtabliſhed among thoſe warlike people. The kings of theſe nations, who were alſo employed either in uſurpation, or ſelf-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their intereſts thoſe whom they conſidered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpoſe, they diſtributed among them extenſive territories, cities, and fortreſſes, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, reſerving to themſelves no more than the ſupreme dominion, and alſo the military ſervice of their powerful vaſſals. This then being the method of governing cuſtomary in *Europe*, it was eſteemed by princes a high inſtance of political prudence to diſtribute among the biſhops, and other Chriſtian doctors, the ſame ſort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that ſuperſtition alone was always the principle that drew forth their liberality. They expected more fidelity and loyalty from a ſet of men, who were bound by the obligations of religion, and conſecrated to the ſervice of God, than from a body of nobility compoſed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accuſtomed to little elſe than blood-ſhed and rapine. And they hoped alſo to check the ſeditious and turbulent ſpirits of their vaſſals, and maintain them, in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the biſhops, whoſe commands were highly reſpected, and whoſe ſpiritual thunderbolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, ſtruck terror into the boldeſt and moſt reſolute hearts [n].

---

[n] The account here given of the riſe of the clergy to ſuch enormous degrees of opulence and authority is corroborated by the following remarkable paſſage of WILLIAM of MALMESBURY (Lib. v. *De rebus geſtis regum Angliæ*) "Carolus Magnus pro contundenda gentium "illarum ferocia, omnes pene terras eccleſiis contulerat, conſilioſiſſime perpendens, nolle ſacri "ordinis homines, tam facile quam Laicos, fidelitatem Domini rejicere: præterea ſi Laici rebel-"larent, illos poſſe excommunicationis auctoritate et potentiæ ſeveritate compeſcere." This is, doubtleſs, the true reaſon why CHARLEMAGNE, who was far from being a ſuperſtitious prince, or a ſlave to the clergy, augmented ſo vaſtly the juriſdiction of the Roman pontif in Germany, Italy, and the other countries, where he had extended his conqueſts, and accumulated upon the biſhops ſuch ample poſſeſſions. He expected more loyalty and ſubmiſſion from the clergy than from the laity, and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to ſecure his

VI. This

Particularly to the Roman pontif.

VI. This prodigious acceſſion to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the weſt began at their head, the Roman pontif, and ſpred gradually from thence among the inferior biſhops, and alſo among the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the goſpel, looked upon the biſhop of *Rome*, as the ſucceſſor of their chief *druid*, or high prieſt. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darkneſs of paganiſm, a boundleſs authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its ſervile exceſs, degenerated into terror; ſo the barbarous nations, upon their converſion to Chriſtianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the biſhops the ſame honours and the ſame authority that had formerly been veſted in their *arch-druid* [o]. The Roman pontif received, with ſomething more than a mere ghoſtly delight, theſe auguſt privileges; and leaſt upon any change of affairs attempts might be made to deprive him of them, he ſtrengthened his title to theſe extraordinary honours, by a variety of paſſages drawn from ancient hiſtory, and, what was ſtill more aſtoniſhing, by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a ſuperſtitious people ſwelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous ſize; and gave to the ſee of *Rome* that high pre-eminence and that deſpotic authority in civil and political matters, that were unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumſtances, aroſe that monſtrous and moſt pernicious opinion, that ſuch perſons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontif himſelf, or any of the biſhops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as citizens, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal ſource of wars, maſſacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any thing elſe to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhappily for *Europe*, borrowed by Chriſtians, or rather by the clergy, from the Pagan ſuperſtitions [p].

---

throne againſt the aſſaults of the latter. As the biſhops were univerſally held in the higheſt veneration, he made uſe of their influence in checking the rebellious ſpirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troubleſome. CHARLEMAGNE, for inſtance, had much to fear from the dukes of *Benevento*, *Spoleto*, and *Capua*, when the government of the Lombards was overturned: he therefore made over a conſiderable part of *Italy* to the *Roman* pontif, whoſe ghoſtly authority, opulence, and threatnings were ſo proper to reſtrain thoſe powerful and vindictive princes from ſeditious inſurrections, or to quell ſuch tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was CHARLEMAGNE the only prince who honoured the clergy from ſuch political views; the other kings and princes of *Europe* acted much in the ſame manner and from the ſame principles, as will appear evident to all who conſider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing that took place in this century. So that the exceſſive augmentation of ſacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of ſuperſtition alone, was, in many inſtances, an effect of political prudence. We ſhall conſider, preſently, the terrors of *excommunication*, which WILLIAM of MALMESBURY touches but curſorily in the latter words of the paſſages above quoted.

[o] CÆSAR ſpeaks thus of the chief or arch-druid: "His omnibus Druidibus præeſt unus, "qui SUMMAM inter eos (Celtas) habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo ſi qui ex reliquis excellit dig-"nitate, ſuccedit. At ſi ſunt plures pares, ſuffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam etiam armis "de principatu contendunt." Vide JUL. CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib vi cap. xiii.

[p] Though *excommunication*, from the time of CONSTANTINE the Great, was, in every part of the Chriſtian world, attended with many diſagreeable effects, yet its higheſt terrors were confined to *Europe*, where its aſpect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired alſo, in the eighth

VII. We

The Roman pontif obtains an addition to his authority, by favouring the ambition of Pepin.

VII. We ſee in the annals of the French nation the following remarkable and ſhocking inſtance of the enormous power that was, at this time, veſted in the Roman pontif. PEPIN, who was *mayor of the palace* to CHILDERIC III, and who, in the exerciſe of that high office, was poſſeſſed, in reality, of the royal power and authority; not contented with this, aſpired to the titles and honours of majeſty, and formed the deſign of dethroning his ſovereign. For this purpoſe the ſtates of the realm were aſſembled by PEPIN, A. D. 751; and though they were devoted to the intereſts of this ambitious uſurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the biſhop of *Rome* was previouſly to be conſulted, whether the execution of ſuch a project was lawful or not. In conſequence of this, ambaſſadors were ſent by PEPIN to ZACHARY, the reigning pontif, with the following queſtion: *Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a puſillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of diſcharging any of the functions of royalty, and to ſubſtitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered moſt important ſervices to the ſtate?* The ſituation of ZACHARY, who ſtood much in need of the ſuccours of PEPIN againſt the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his anſwer ſuch as the uſurper deſired. And when his favourable deciſion of the Roman oracle was publiſhed in *France*, the unhappy CHILDERIC was ſtript of his royalty without the leaſt oppoſition; and PEPIN, without the ſmalleſt reſiſtance from any quarter, ſtept into the throne of his maſter and his ſovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority ſee, how they can juſtify in CHRIST's pretended vice-gerent upon earth a deciſion, which is ſo glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour [q].

---

century, new acceſſions of terror; ſo that, from that period, the *excommunication* practiſed in *Europe* differed entirely from that which was in uſe in other parts of *Chriſtendom*. Excommunicated perſons were indeed conſidered, in all places, as objects of averſion both to God and men: but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, nor of the rights of humanity; much leſs were thoſe kings and princes, whom an inſolent biſhop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, ſuppoſed to forfeit, on that account, their crowns or their territories. But, from this century, it was quite otherwiſe in *Europe*; excommunication received that infernal power which diſſolved all connexions; ſo that thoſe whom the biſhops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beaſts. Under this horrid ſentence the king, the ruler, the huſband, the father, nay, even the *man* forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of ſociety. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: Upon the converſion of the barbarous nations to Chriſtianity, theſe new and ignorant proſelytes confounded the *excommunication* in uſe among Chriſtians with *that* which had been practiſed in the times of paganiſm by the prieſts of the gods, and conſidered them as of the ſame nature and effect. The Roman pontifs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error, and, therefore, employed all ſorts of means to gain credit to an opinion ſo proper to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandize, in general, the epiſcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extenſive and horrid influence of the European and Papal excommnnication, will appear evident to ſuch as caſt an eye upon the following paſſage of CÆSAR. *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii. "Si qui aut
"privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non ſtetit, ſacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc poena eſt apud eos
"graviſſima. Quibus ita eſt interdictum, ii numero impiorum et ſceleratorum habentur, iis omnes
"decedunt, aditum eorum ſermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant:
"neque iis potentibus JUS REDDITUR, neque honos ullus communicatur."

[q] See LE COINTE *Annal. Franciæ Eccleſ.* MEZERAY, DANIEL, and the other Gallic and German hiſtorians, concerning this important event; but particularly BOSSUET *Defenſ. declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, part I. p. 225. PETR. RIVAL *Diſſertations Hiſtor. et Critiques ſur divers ſujets,*

This deciſion was ſolemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II, the ſucceſſor of ZACHARY, who undertook a journey into *France*, in the year 754, in order to ſollicit aſſiſtance againſt the Lombards; and who, at the ſame time, diſſolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which PEPIN had ſworn to CHILDERIC, and violated, by his uſurpation, in the year 751. And to render his title to the crown as ſacred as poſſible, STEPHEN anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two ſons, for the ſecond time [*r*].

The advantages derived to the ſee of *Rome* from the attachment of its biſhops to the kings of *France*.

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontifs proved an abundant ſource of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aſpiring miniſters. When that part of *Italy*, which was as yet ſubject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confuſion and trouble, by the ſeditions and tumults which aroſe from the imperial edicts [*s*], againſt the erection and worſhip of images; the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negociations in order to terminate theſe conteſts. Their ſucceſs, indeed, was only advantageous to themſelves; for they managed matters ſo as to become, by degrees, maſters of the Grecian provinces in *Italy*, which were ſubject to the Exarch, who reſided at *Ravenna*. Nay, one of theſe monarchs, named AISTULPHUS, carried his views ſtill further. Elated with theſe new acceſſions to his dominions, he meditated the conqueſt of *Rome* and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all *Italy* under the yoke of the Lombards. The terrified pontif, STEPHEN II, addreſſes himſelf to his powerful patron and protector PEPIN, repreſents to him his deplorable condition, and implores his aſſiſtance. The French monarch embarks, with zeal, in the cauſe of the ſuppliant pontif; croſſes the *Alps*, A. D. 754, with a numerous army; and having defeated AISTULPHUS, obliged him, by a ſolemn treaty, to deliver up to the ſee of *Rome* the exarchate of *Ravenna*, *Pentapolis*, and all the cities, caſtles, and territories which he had ſeized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard

The donation of Pepin to that ſee.

Diſſ. ii. p. 70. Diſſ. iii. p. 156. *Lond.* 1726, in 8^{vo}. HENR. de BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 288. This remarkable event is not, indeed, related in the ſame manner by all hiſtorians, and it is generally repreſented under the falſeſt colours by thoſe, who, from a ſpirit of blind zeal and exceſſive adulation, ſeize every occaſion of exalting the dignity and authority of the biſhops of *Rome*. Such writers aſſert, that it was by ZACHARY's authority as pontif, and not, in conſequence of his opinion as a caſuiſt or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of CHILDERIC, and placed upon that of PEPIN. But this the French abſolutely and juſtly deny. Had it, however, been ſo, the crime of the pontif would have been much greater than it was in reality.

[(*r*) PEPIN had been anointed, by the legate BONIFACE at *Soiſſons*, ſoon after his election; but thinking that ceremony performed by the pope, would recommend him more to the reſpect of his ſubjects, he deſired that it ſhould be performed anew by STEPHEN. PEPIN is the firſt French monarch, who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at leaſt according to the reports of the moſt credible hiſtorians. His predeceſſors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a ſhield, and the *holy phial* of CLOVIS is now univerſally regarded as fabulous. The cuſtom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of PEPIN, and was obſerved long before that period both in *Scotland* and *Spain*. See EDMUND MARTENE, *De Antiq. Eccleſ. Ritib.* tom. iii. cap. x. As alſo BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366.]

[(*s*) The author has here in view the edicts of LEO ISAURICUS and CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS. The former publiſhed, in the year 726, a famous edict againſt the worſhip of images, which occaſioned many conteſts and much diſturbance both in church and ſtate; and the latter aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, in the year 754, a council of 338 biſhops, who unanimouſly condemned not only the *worſhip*, but alſo the *uſe*, of images.]

prince violated, without remorſe, an engagement which he had entered into with reluctance. In the year 755 he laid ſiege to *Rome* for the ſecond time, but was again obliged to ſue for peace by the victorious arms of PEPIN, who returned into *Italy*, and forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had ſo audaciouſly violated, made a new grant of the exarchate [*t*], and of *Pentapolis* to the Roman pontif and his ſucceſſors in the apoſtolic ſee of St. PETER. And thus was the biſhop of *Rome* raiſed to the rank of a temporal prince.

Charlemagne's grant to the ſee of *Rome*.

IX. After the death of PEPIN, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. PETER, by DIDERIC king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the French monarch to the ſee of *Rome*. In this extremity, ADRIAN I, who was pontif at that time, fled for ſuccour to CHARLES, the ſon of PEPIN, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards diſtinguiſhed by the name of CHARLEMAGNE. This prince, whoſe enterpriſing genius led him to ſeize with avidity every opportunity of extending his conqueſts, and whoſe veneration for the Roman ſee was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as ſuperſtition, adopted immediately the cauſe of the trembling pontif. He paſſed the *Alps* with a formidable army A. D. 774, overturned the empire of the Lombards in *Italy*, which had ſubſiſted above two hundred years, ſent their exiled monarch into *France*, and proclaimed himſelf king of the Lombards. Theſe conqueſts offered to CHARLEMAGNE an occaſion of viſiting *Rome*, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that ſee, but added to them new donations, and made to the Roman pontifs a ceſſion of ſeveral cities and provinces in *Italy*, which had not been contained in PEPIN's grant. What thoſe cities and provinces were, is a queſtion difficult to be reſolved at this period of time, as it is perplexed with much obſcurity, from the want of authentic records, by which alone it can be decided with certainty [u].

[*t*] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiæ*, lib. iii. p. 202. tom. ii. Opp. BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366. MURATORI *Annali d'Italiæ*, tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the *exarchate*, granted by PEPIN to the Roman pontif, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the reſearches of ſeveral eminent writers. The biſhops of *Rome* extend the limits of this *exarchate* as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability; while their adverſaries are as zealous in contracting this famous grant within narrower bounds. See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, cap. i, ii. As alſo his *Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom i. p. 64. 68. 986, 987. The ſame author treats the matter with more circumſpection, *tom.* v. p. 790. This controverſy can only be terminated with facility by an inſpection of PEPIN's grant of the territory in queſtion. FONTANINI, in his *Firſt defence of the temporal juriſdiction of the ſee of Rome over the city of Commachio*, written in Italian, intimates, that this grant is ſtill in being, and even makes uſe of ſome phraſes that are contained in it (ſee the pages 242 and 346 of that work). This, however, will ſcarcely be believed. Were it, indeed, true that ſuch a deed is yet in being, its being publiſhed to the world would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretenſions and intereſts of the church of *Rome*. It is at leaſt certain, that in the recent diſpute between the emperor JOSEPH and the Roman pontif concerning the city of *Commachio*; the partiſans of the latter, though frequently called upon by thoſe of the emperor to produce this grant, refuſed conſtantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand it muſt be confeſſed, that BLANCHINUS, in his *Prolegom. ad Anaſtaſium de vitis pontif. Rom.* p. 55. has given us, from a Farneſian manuſcript, a ſpecimen of this grant, which ſeems to carry the marks of a remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witneſſes unite in aſſuring us, that the remorſe of a wounded conſcience was the ſource of PEPIN's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontif was the ſuperſtitious remedy by which he hoped to expiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his maſter CHILDERIC.

The motives to which it is to be attributed.

X. By this act of liberality, which ſeems to carry in it the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, Charlemagne opened for himſelf a paſſage to the empire of the weſt, and to the ſupreme dominion over the city of *Rome* and its territory, upon which the weſtern empire ſeemed then to depend [w]. He had, no doubt, been meditating for a conſiderable time this arduous project, which his father Pepin had probably formed before him; but the circumſtances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occaſion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in the year 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to the utmoſt extremity after the death of Leo III, and the barbarous murder of his ſon Constantine, and while the impious Irene held the reigns of empire. This favourable opportunity was ſeized with avidity by Charles, who ſet out for *Rome*, where he was received with the utmoſt demonſtrations of zeal by the ſovereign pontif [x], who had entered into his views, and perſuaded the people, elated at this time with high notions of their independency and elective power, to unite their ſuffrages in favour of this prince, and to proclaim him emperor of the weſt [y].

---

[u] See Car. Sigonius, *De regno Italiæ*, lib. iii. p. 223. tom. ii. Opp. Bunau, *Hiſtoria Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 368. Petr. de Marca, *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67. Lud. Anton. Muratori *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, cap ii. p. 147. Conringius, *De Imperio Roman. German.* cap. vi. The extent of Charlemagne's grant to the ſee of *Rome* is as much diſputed as that of Pepin's, between the partiſans of the pope, and thoſe of the emperors. They, who plead the cauſe of the Roman ſee, maintain, that *Corſica*, *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, the territory of *Sabino*, the dutchy of *Spoleto*, and ſeveral other places were ſolemnly granted, by Charlemagne, to St. Peter and his ſucceſſors. They, on the other hand, who aſſert the rights of the emperor, diminiſh, as far as they can, the munificence of Charles, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may conſult upon this ſubject the authors of the preſent age, who have publiſhed their opinions concerning the pretenſions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of *Commachio* and *Florence*, and the dutchies of *Parma* and *Placentia*; but above all, the learned Berret's excellent treatiſe, intitled, *Diſſertatio Chorographica de Italia medii ævi*, f. 33. The ſpirit of party ſeems, in this controverſy, as in many others, to have blinded the diſputants on both ſides of the queſtion; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding miſtakes upon a point involved in ſuch deep obſcurity, has, in many caſes, rendered the truth inviſible to both the contending parties. With reſpect to the motives that induced Charlemagne to make this grant, they are much leſs doubtful than the extent of the grant itſelf. Adrian affirms, that the monarch's view was to *atone for his ſins* by this act of liberality to the church, as we ſee in a letter from that pontif to Charlemagne, which is publiſhed in Muratori's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 265. and of which the following paſſage is remarkable: "Venientes "ad nos de Capua, quam Beato Petro apoſtolorum principi pro mercede animæ vestræ atque "ſempiterna memoria cum ceteris civitatibus obtuliſtis." It is not indeed unlikely, that Charlemagne, who affected that kind of piety which was the characteriſtic of this barbarous age, mentioned this ſuperſtitious motive in the act of ceſſion by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but ſuch as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the hiſtory of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generoſity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obſtinately bent upon adding the weſtern empire to his dominions, and the ſucceſs of this grand project depended much upon the conſent and aſſiſtance of the Roman pontif, whoſe approbation, in thoſe times, was ſufficient to ſanctify the moſt iniquitous projects; ſo that Charlemagne laviſhed gifts upon the biſhops of *Rome*, that, by their aſſiſtance, he might aſſume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the weſt, and confirm his new dominion in *Italy*. This policy we have taken notice of already, and it muſt appear manifeſt to all who view things with the ſmalleſt degree of impartiality and attention.

[w] Charles, in reality, was already emperor of the weſt, that is, the moſt powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the ſupreme dominion in *Rome* and its territory, both of which he obtained by the aſſiſtance of Leo III.

The nature and form of the Roman pontif's juriſdiction.

XI. CHARLES, upon his elevation to the empire of the weſt and the government of *Rome*, ſeems to have reſerved to himſelf only the ſupreme dominion, and the unalienable rights of majeſty, and to have granted to the church of *Rome* a ſubordinate juriſdiction over that great city, and its annexed territory [z]. This grant was undoubtedly ſuggeſted to him by the ambitious pontif as a matter of ſacred and indiſpenſable obligation, and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretenſions, and juſtify the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil juriſdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was, no doubt, alledged, that CONSTANTINE the GREAT, his renowned predeceſſor, when he removed the ſeat of the empire to *Conſtantinople*, delivered up *Rome*, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be poſſeſſed and governed by the church, and that with no other reſtriction than that this ſhould be no detriment to his ſupreme dominion; and it was inſinuated to CHARLES, that he could not depart from the rule eſtabliſhed by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. PETER [a].

---

[x] LEO III.

[y] See the hiſtorians who have tranſmitted to us accounts of this century, and more eſpecially BUNAU, *Hiſtoria Imperii Romano-German.* tom. ii. p. 537. The partiſans of the Roman pontifs generally maintain, that LEO III, by a *divine* right, veſted in him as biſhop of *Rome*, tranſported the weſtern empire from the Greeks to the Francs, and conferred it upon CHARLEMAGNE, the monarch of the latter. From hence they conclude, that the Roman pontif, as the vicar of CHRIST, is the ſupreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner, of the Roman empire. The temerity of theſe pretenſions, and the abſurdity of this reaſoning, are expoſed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated FRED. SPANHEIM, *De ficta tranſlatione imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem* III, tom. ii. Opp. p. 557.

[z] That CHARLEMAGNE, in effect, preſerved entire his ſupreme authority over the city of *Rome* and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, puniſhed malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives and exerciſed all the functions of royalty, has been demonſtrated by ſeveral of the learned in the moſt ample and ſatisfactory manner, and confirmed by the moſt unexceptionable and authentic teſtimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be ſufficient to conſult MURATORI's *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they muſt have a ſtrange power of reſiſting the cleareſt evidence, who are abſurd enough to aſſert, as does FONTANINI, in his treatiſe, intitled, *Dominio della S. Sede ſopra Comachio*, Diſſ. i. c. 95, 96. that CHARLES ſuſtained at *Rome* the character of the *advocate* of the Roman church, and not that of its ſovereign or its lord, the dominion of the pontifs being unlimited and univerſal. On the other hand, we muſt acknowledge ingenuouſly that the power of the pontif, both in the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in ſeveral caſes, he ſeemed to act with a princely authority. But the extent, and the foundations of that authority, are matters hid in the deepeſt obſcurity, and have thereby given occaſion to endleſs diſputes. MURATORI maintains, in his work above cited, p. 102. that the biſhop of *Rome* diſcharged the function of *exarch*, or *vicar*, to the emperor, an opinion which CLEMENT XI rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any ſolid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumſtances that can contribute towards the ſolution of this perplexed queſtion, the moſt probable account of the matter ſeems to be this: That the Roman pontif poſſeſſed the city of *Rome* and its territory by the ſame right that he held the exarchate of *Ravenna* and the other lands of which he received the grant from CHARLEMAGNE; that is to ſay, that he poſſeſſed *Rome* as a feudal tenure, though charged with leſs marks of dependance than other fiefs generally are, on account of the luſtre and dignity of a city which had been ſo long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much ſtrength from what we ſhall have occaſion to obſerve in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring teſtimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

The Grecian emperors check the ambition of the Roman pontifs, and diminiſh their revenues.

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontifs were riſing to the greateſt height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in conſequence of a quarrel which broke out between theſe haughty pontifs and the Grecian emperors. LEO the Iſaurian, and his ſon CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, incenſed at the zeal which GREGORY II and III diſcovered for the worſhip of images, not only confiſcated the treaſures and lands which the church of *Rome* poſſeſſed in *Sicily*, *Calabria*, and *Apulia*, but moreover withdrew the biſhops of theſe countries, and alſo the various provinces and churches of *Illyricum*, from the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee, and ſubjected them to the ſpiritual dominion of the biſhop of *Conſtantino-*

---

[a] Moſt writers are of opinion, that CONSTANTINE's pretended grant was poſterior to this period, and was forged in the tenth century. It appears to me, on the contrary, that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century, and it is extremely probable that both ADRIAN and his ſucceſſor LEO III made uſe of it to perſuade CHARLEMAGNE to that donation. In favour of this opinion, we have the unexceptionable teſtimony of ADRIAN himſelf in his letter to CHARLEMAGNE, which is publiſhed in MURATORI's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. part II. p. 194. and which is extremely worthy of an attentive peruſal. In this letter, ADRIAN exhorts CHARLES, before his elevation to the empire, to order the reſtitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. PETER, and to the church of *Rome*. In this demand alſo he diſtinguiſhes, in the plaineſt manner, the donation of CONSTANTINE from thoſe of the other princes and emperors, and, what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of PEPIN, and even from the additions that CHARLES had already made to his father's grant; from whence we may juſtly conclude, that by the *donation of* CONSTANTINE, ADRIAN meant the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory. He ſpeaks firſt of this grant in the following terms: "Deprecamur " veſtram Excellentiam . . . pro Dei amore et ipſius clavigeri regni cœlorum . . . ut ſecundum pro-" miſſionem quam polliciti eſtis eidem Dei apoſtolo PRO ANIMÆ VESTRÆ MERCEDE et ſtabilitate " regni veſtri, omnia noſtris temporibus adimplere jubeatis . . . et ſicut temporibus beati SILVESTRI " Romani pontificis, a ſanctæ recordationis piiſſimo CONSTANTINO M. Imperatore, PER EJUS " LARGITATEM (here CONSTANTINE's donation is evidently mentioned) ſancta Dei catholica et " apoſtolica Romana eccleſia elevata atque exaltata eſt, et POTESTATEM in his Heſperiæ partibus " LARGIRI dignatus eſt: ita et in his veſtris feliciſſimis temporibus atque noſtris ſancta Dei eccleſia " germinet . . . et amplius atque amplius exaltata permaneat . . . quia ecce novus Chriſtianiſſimus " Dei gratiâ Conſtantinus imperator (here we ſee CHARLES, who at that time wás only a *king*, " ſtyled *emperor* by the pontif, and compared with CONSTANTINE) his temporibus ſurrexit, per " quem omnia Deus ſanctæ ſuæ eccleſiæ . . . largiri dignatus eſt." So much for that part of the letter that relates to CONSTANTINE's grant: as to the other donations which the pontif evidently diſtinguiſhes from it, obſerve what follows: "SED ET CUNCTA ALIA quæ per diverſos Impera-" tores, Patricios, etiam et alios Deum timentes, PRO EORUM ANIMÆ MERCEDE ET VENIA DE-" LICTORUM, in partibus Tuſciæ, Spoleto, ſeu Benevento, atque Corſica, ſimul et Pavinenſi patri-" monio, beato Petro apoſtolo conceſſa ſunt, et per neſandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum " ſpatia abſtracta et ablata ſunt veſtris temporibus, reſtituantur." (The pontif intimates further, that all theſe grants were carefully preſerved in the office of the Lateran, and that he ſends them to CHARLES by his legates.) "Unde et plures donationes in ſacro noſtro ſcrinio Lateranenſi reconditas " habemus, tamen et pro ſatisfactione Chriſtianiſſimi regni veſtri, per jam fatos viros, ad demonſtran-" dum eas vobis, direximus, et pro hoc petimus eximiam præcellentiam veſtram, ut in integro ipſa " patrimonia Beato PETRO et nobis reſtituere jubeatis." By this it appears, that CONSTANTINE's grant was now in being among the archives of the Lateran, and was ſent to CHARLEMAGNE with the other donations of kings and princes, whoſe examples were made uſe of to excite his liberality to the church.

ple. And ſo inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontifs, that no entreaties, ſupplications, nor threats could engage them to abandon their purpoſe, or to reſtore this rich and ſignal portion of St. PETER's patrimony to his greedy ſucceſſors [*b*]. It is here that we muſt look for the original ſource, and the principal cauſe of that vehement conteſt between the Roman pontif and the biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, which, in the following century, divided the Greek and Latin churches, and was ſo pernicious to the intereſts and advancement of true Chriſtianity. Theſe lamentable diviſions, which wanted no new incident to foment them, were, nevertheleſs, augmented by a controverſy which aroſe, in this century, concerning the *derivation of the Holy Spirit*, which we ſhall have occaſion to mention more largely in its proper place. But it is more than probable, that this controverſy would have been terminated with the utmoſt facility, had not the ſpirits of the contending parties been previouſly exaſperated by diſputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and carried on, without either moderation or decency by the *holy* patriarchs of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, in defence of their reſpective pretenſions.

The monaſtic diſcipline fallen into decay.

XIII. The monaſtic diſcipline was extremely relaxed at this time both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, and, as appears by the concurring teſtimonies of the writers of this century, was fallen into a total decay. The only monks who eſcaped this general corruption, were they who paſſed their days in the deſarts of *Egypt*, *Syria*, and *Meſopotamia*, amidſt the auſterities of a wretched life, and remote from all the comforts of human ſociety: yet the merit of having preſerved their diſcipline was ſadly counterbalanced by the groſs ignorance, the fanatical madneſs, and the ſordid ſuperſtition that reigned among theſe miſerable hermits. Thoſe of the monaſtic orders who lived nearer cities and populous towns, troubled frequently the public tranquillity by the tumults and ſeditions they fomented among the multitude, ſo that it became neceſſary to check their rebellious ambition by the ſevere laws that were enacted againſt them by CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, and other emperors. The greateſt part of the weſtern monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. BENEDICT; though there were every where convents which adopted the diſcipline of other orders [*c*]. But as they increaſed in opulence they loſt ſight of all rules, and ſubmitted, at length, to no other diſcipline than that of intemperance, voluptuouſneſs, and ſloth [*d*]. CHARLEMAGNE attempted, by various edicts, to put a ſtop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little ſucceſs [*e*].

[*b*] See MICH. LEQUIEN's *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 96. Among the Greek writers alſo THEOPHANES and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reaſons to which it is to be attributed.

[*c*] See MABILLON *Præf. ad acta SS. Ord. Benedicti*, Sæc. i. p. 24. and Sæc. iv. part. I. p. 26.

[*d*] The author mentioned in the preceding note diſcourſes with a noble frankneſs and courage concerning the corruption of the monks and its various cauſes, in the ſame work, *Præf. ad* Sæc. iv. part. I. p. 64.

[*e*] See the *Capitularia Caroli*, publiſhed by BALUZIUS, tom. i. p. 148. 157. 237. 355. 366. 375. 503. Laws, ſo ſevere, and ſo often repeated, ſhew evidently that the corruption of the monks muſt have been truly enormous.

The origin of the order of canons.

XIV. This univerſal depravity and corruption of the monks gave riſe to a new order of prieſts in the weſt, which was a ſort of a middle order between the *monks* or *regulars*, and the *ſecular clergy*. This new ſpecies of eccleſiaſtics adopted the monaſtic diſcipline and manner of life, ſo ſar as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to aſſemble themſelves at certain hours for divine ſervice; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were alſo appointed to diſcharge the miniſterial functions in certain churches which were committed to their paſtoral direction. Theſe eccleſiaſtics were at firſt called *fratres dominici*, but ſoon after received the name of *canons* [*f*]. The common opinion attributes the inſtitution of this order to Chrodegangus, biſhop of *Metz:* nor is this opinion deſtitute of truth [*g*]. For though before this time there were in *Italy*, *Africa*, and other provinces, convents of eccleſiaſtics, who lived after the manner of the *canons* [*h*]; yet Chrodegangus, who, towards the middle of this century, ſubjected to this rule the clergy of *Metz*, not only added to their religious ceremonies the cuſtom of ſinging hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of other rites, but alſo, by his example, excited the Francs, the Italians, and the Germans to diſtinguiſh themſelves by their zeal in favour of the *canons*, to erect monaſteries for them, and to introduce their rule into their reſpective countries.

The authority of the Roman pontifs limited by, and ſubordinate to, that of the emperors.

XV. The ſupreme dominion over the church and its poſſeſſions was veſted in the emperors and kings, both in the eaſtern and the weſtern world. The ſovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this reſpect, has never been conteſted; and though the partiſans of the Roman pontifs endeavour to render dubious the ſupremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this ſupremacy is too manifeſt to be diſputed by ſuch as have conſidered the matter attentively [*i*], and it is acknowledged by the wiſeſt and moſt candid writers even of the Romiſh communion. Adrian I, in a council of biſhops aſſembled at *Rome*, conferred upon Charlemagne, and his ſucceſſors, the right of election to the ſee of *Rome* [*k*]; and though neither Charlemagne, nor his ſon LEWIS, were willing to exerciſe this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontif upon every vacancy, yet they reſerved the right of approving and confirming the perſon that was elected to that high dignity by the prieſts and people: nor was the conſecration of the elected pontif of the leaſt validity, unleſs performed in preſence of the emperor's ambaſſadors [*l*]. The Roman pontifs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial deciſions, as of indiſpenſable obligation, and executed them with the utmoſt punctuality and ſubmiſſion [*m*]. The kings of the Francs appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *envoys*, to inſpect into the lives and manners of the clergy ſuperior and inferior, to take cognizance of their conteſts, to terminate their diſputes, to enact laws concerning the public worſhip, and to puniſh the crimes of the ſacred order, as well as thoſe of the other citizens [*n*]. All churches alſo, and monaſteries, were obliged to pay to the public treaſury a tribute proportioned to their reſpective lands and poſſeſſions, except ſuch as, by the pure favour of the ſupreme powers, were graciouſly exempted from this general tax [*o*].

[*f*] See Le Beuf *Memoirs ſur l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 174. the *Paris* edition, publiſhed in 1743, in 4to.

[*g*] See, for an account of Chrodegangus, the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p 128. Calmet, *Hiſtoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 513. *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Martii*, p. 452. The rule which he preſcribed to his *canons*, may be ſeen in Le Cointe's *Annales Francor. Eccleſ.* tom. v. *ad A.* 757. § 35; as alſo in the *Concilia Labbei*, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is publiſhed in his name, in the *Spicilegium Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 565. Longueval, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. iv. p. 435. has given a neat and elegant abridgement of the rule of Chrodegangus.

[*h*] See Lud. Ant. Murator. *Antiq. Italicar. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 185; as alſo Lud. Thomassin. *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ Vet. et Nov.* part. i. lib. iii. The deſign of this inſtitution was truly excellent. The authors of it juſtly ſhocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new inſtitution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering them from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this preſent life. But the event has ſhewn how much theſe pious hopes have been diſappointed.

[*i*] For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to Lequiens, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 136.

[*k*] This *Act* is mentioned by Anastasius: it has been preſerved by Yvo and Gratian, and has been the ſubject of a multitude of treatiſes.

Confined within narrow limits.

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not aſſume to themſelves the adminiſtration of the church, or the cognizance and deciſion of controverſies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged, on the contrary, that theſe matters belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontif and of the eccleſiaſtical councils [*p*]. But this juriſdiction of the pontif was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his ſole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controverſy aroſe, wait for the deciſion of the biſhop of *Rome*; but aſſembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the biſhops gave their thoughts, with the utmoſt freedom, upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct oppoſition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontif: all which is evident from what paſſed in the councils aſſembled by the Francs and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controverſy concerning the uſe and worſhip of images. It is further to be obſerved, that the power of convening councils, and the right of preſiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and ſovereign princes, in whoſe dominions theſe aſſemblies were held; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the ſupreme magiſtrate [*q*]. Thus was the ſpiritual authority of *Rome* wiſely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontifs, fretted under the imperial curb, and eager to break looſe their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpoſe. Nay, they formed projects which ſeemed leſs the effects of ambition than of frenzy; for they claimed a ſupreme dominion, not only over the church, but alſo over kings themſelves, and pretended to reduce the whole univerſe under their ghoſtly juriſdiction. However extravagant theſe pretenſions were, they were followed by the moſt vigorous efforts, and the wars and tumults that aroſe in the following century, contributed much to render theſe efforts ſucceſsful.

[*l*] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ordinem Romanum, Muſei Italici*, tom. ii. p. 113. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, p. 87.

[*m*] This has been amply demonſtrated by BALUZIUS, in his *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francorum*, § 21.

[*n*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. i. Diſſ. ix. p. 470. FRANC. de ROYE *De Miſſis Dominicis*, cap. x. p. 44. cap. viii. p. 118. 134. 168. 195.

[*o*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. Diſſ. xvii. p. 926. See alſo the collection of the various pieces that were publiſhed on occaſion of the diſpute between LEWIS XV and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that Order in *France*. Theſe pieces were printed at the *Hague* in the year 1751, in ſeven volumes, 8^{vo}, under the following title: *Ecrits pour et contre les immunités pretendues par le Clergé de France.*

[*p*] See the Diſſertation of CHARLEMAGNE, *De imaginibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 48. edit. *Heumann.*

Grecian and eaſtern writers.

XVII. If we turn our eyes towards the writers of this century, we ſhall find very few that ſtand diſtinguiſhed in the liſts of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only ſeem worthy of mention.

GERMANUS, biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, the greateſt part of whoſe high renown was due to his violent zeal for image-worſhip [*r*].

COSMAS, biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who acquired ſome reputation by his Lyric vein, conſecrated to the ſervice of religion, and employed in compoſing hymns for public and private devotion.

GEORGE SYNCELLUS and THEOPHANES, who are not the leaſt conſiderable among the writers of the Byzantine hiſtory, though they be in all reſpects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin hiſtorians.

But the writer, who ſurpaſſed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was JOHN DAMASCENUS, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philoſophy, and illuſtrated the main and capital points of the Chriſtian doctrine. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the eminent talents of this great man were tainted with that ſordid ſuperſtition, and that exceſſive veneration for the ancient fathers, that were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining the doctrines of the goſpel according to the principles of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy [*s*].

Weſtern and Latin writers.

XVIII. The firſt place among the Latin writers is due to CHARLEMAGNE, whoſe love of letters was one of the bright ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of *Capitularia*, with ſeveral *Epiſtles*, and a *Book concerning images*, are attributed to this prince; though it ſeems highly probable, that the moſt of theſe compoſitions were drawn up by other pens [*t*].

---

[q] All this is fully and admirably demonſtrated by BALUZIUS, in his Preface to the *Capitularia*, or laws of the kings of the Francs, and is alſo amply illuſtrated in that work. See alſo J. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 270.

[r] See RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 270.

[s] BAYLE *Diction.* tom. ii. p. 950; as alſo the account of the writings of JOHN DAMASCENUS, which is publiſhed in LE QUIEN's edition of his works, and was compoſed by LEO ALLATIUS.

[t] See JO. A. FABRICII *Bibliotheca medii ævi Lat.* tom. i. p. 936. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de France*, tom. iv. p. 378.

After this learned prince, we may juſtly place venerable BEDE, ſo called from his illuſtrious virtues [u]; ALCUIN [w], the preceptor of CHARLEMAGNE; PAULINUS of *Aquileia* [x], who were all diſtinguiſhed by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and ſcience, and who treated the various branches of literature, that were known in this century, in ſuch a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the times, rather than the want of genius, that hindred them from ariſing to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to theſe BONIFACE, of whom we have already ſpoken; EGINARD, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, and other productions; PAUL, the deacon, who acquired a conſiderable and laſting reputation by his *Hiſtory of the Lombards*, his *Book of Homilies*, and his miſcellaneous labours; AMBROSE AUTHPERT, who wrote a commentary on the *Revelations*; and THEODULPHUS biſhop of *Orleans*; and thus we ſhall have a complete liſt of all the writers who acquired any degree of eſteem in this century, by their literary productions, either ſacred or profane.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The Chriſtian doctrine ſadly corrupted.

I. THE fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity were, as yet, reſpected and preſerved in the theological writings both of the Greeks and Latins, as ſeems evident from the diſcourſe of JOHN DAMASCENUS, *concerning the orthodox faith*, and the confeſſion of faith which was drawn up by CHARLEMAGNE [y]. The pure ſeed of celeſtial truth was, however, choked by a monſtrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational ſimplicity of the Chriſtian worſhip was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other ſuperſtitious inventions, and the ſacred flame of divine charity was extinguiſhed by the violent contentions and animoſities, which the progreſs of theſe ſuperſtitions occaſioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, one way or another, laboured, in effect, to diminiſh the perſuaſion of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching that Chriſtians might appeaſe an offended deity by volun-

[u] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. *April.* p. 866. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article of BEDE. A liſt of the writings of this venerable *Briton*, compoſed by himſelf, is publiſhed by MURATORI, in his *Antiq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 825.

[w] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 295. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article ALCUIN. CATELINOT, who has diſcovered the treatiſe of ALCUIN, *De Proceſſione Spiritus S.* which has never been publiſhed, is preparing an edition of all the works of that learned writer. See the *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. *Præf.* p. 10.

[x] See *Hiſt. Litteraire*, &c. tom. iv. p. 286. *Acta Sanct.* tom. i. *Januar.* p. 713.

[y] See the treatiſe of this prince, *Concerning images*, book III. p. 259. ed. *Heumanni.* Of the Greek writers, the reader may conſult MICH. SYNCELLUS, his *Confeſſion of faith*, publiſhed by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 90; and among the Latins, *An expoſition of the principal doctrine of the Chriſtian religion*, compoſed by BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, and publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in his *Miſcellanea*, tom. v. p. 56; as alſo the *Creed* of LEO III, publiſhed in the ſame work, *tom.* vii. *p.* 18.

tary acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations laviſhed upon the church, and by exhorting ſuch as were deſirous of ſalvation to place their confidence in the works and merits of the ſaints. Were we to enlarge upon all the abſurdities and ſuperſtitions which were invented to flatter the paſſions of the miſguided multitude, and to increaſe, at the expence of reaſon and Chriſtianity, the opulence and authority of a licentious clergy; ſuch an immenſe quantity of odious materials would ſwell this work to an enormous ſize.

The piety and morals of this age.

II. The piety in vogue during this and ſome ſucceeding ages conſiſted in building, and embelliſhing churches and chapels, in endowing monaſteries, erecting baſilics, hunting after the relicks of ſaints and martyrs, and treating them with an exceſſive and abſurd veneration, in procuring the interceſſion of the ſaints by rich oblations or ſuperſtitious rites, in worſhiping images, in pilgrimages to thoſe places which were eſteemed holy, and chiefly to *Paleſtine*, and ſuch like abſurd and extravagant practices and inſtitutions. The pious Chriſtian, and the profligate tranſgreſſor, ſhewed equal zeal in the performance of theſe ſuperſtitious ſervices, which were looked upon as of the higheſt efficacy in order to the attainment of eternal ſalvation; they were performed by the latter as an expiation for their crimes, and a mean of appeaſing an offended deity; and by the former with a view to obtain, from above, the good things of this life, and an eaſy and commodious paſſage to life eternal. The true and genuine religion of Jesus, if we except a few of its doctrines contained in the *Creed*, was utterly unknown in this century, not only to the multitude in general, but alſo to the doctors of the firſt rank and eminence in the church, and the conſequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal to the intereſts of virtue. All orders of men, regardleſs of the obligations of morality of the duties of the goſpel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds, ruſhed headlong with a perfect ſecurity into all ſorts of wickedneſs, from the deluſive hopes, that by the interceſſion and prayers of the ſaints, and the credit of the prieſts at the throne of God, they would eaſily obtain the remiſſion of their enormities, and render the deity propitious. This diſmal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century is confirmed by the unanimous teſtimony of all the hiſtorians who have written concerning that period.

Exegetical or explanatory theology.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy ſcriptures had been ſucceſsfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined, that they rendered a moſt important ſervice to the ſtudents in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted and compiled from the works of theſe admired ſages their explanatory obſervations on the ſacred writings. The commentary of John Damascenus, upon the epiſtles of St. Paul, which was taken from the writings of Chrysostom, is alone ſufficient to ſerve as a proof of the little diſcernment with which theſe compilations were generally made.

The Latin expoſitors may be divided into two claſſes, according to the different nature of their productions. In the firſt, we place thoſe writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. Bede diſtinguiſhed himſelf among the expoſitors of this claſs by his explication of the epiſtles of St. PAUL, drawn from the writings of AUGUSTIN and others [z]. Still more eſtimable are the writers of the ſecond claſs, who made uſe of their own penetration and ſagacity in inveſtigating the ſenſe of the holy ſcriptures, ſuch as ALCUIN, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, the expoſitors of the *Revelations*, nay and BEDE alſo, who belongs, in reality, to both claſſes. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, that all theſe commentators were deſtitute of the qualities that are eſſential to the ſacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting entirely the natural ſenſe of the words of ſcripture, and running blind-fold after a certain hidden and myſtical meaning, which, to uſe their jargon, they uſually divided into *allegorical*, *anagogical*, and *tropological* [a]; and thus delivering their own raſh fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine ſentiments of the ſacred writers. Of this we are furniſhed with many examples in ALCUIN's *commentary on St. John*; BEDE's *allegorical illuſtrations of the books of Samuel*; and CHARLEMAGNE's *book concerning images*, in which various paſſages of the holy ſcriptures are occaſionally explained according to the taſte of the times [b].

Charlemagne's zeal for the ſtudy of the ſcriptures.

IV. The veneration of CHARLEMAGNE for the ſacred writings was carried to ſuch an exceſſive length [c], as to perſuade that monarch, that they contained the latent ſeeds and principles of all arts and ſciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the leſſons of his preceptor ALCUIN, and the other divines who frequented his court [d]. Hence the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy to direct their pious labours towards the illuſtration of the holy ſcriptures. Several laws which he publiſhed to encourage this ſpecies of learning are yet extant, as alſo various monuments of his deep ſollicitude about the advancement and propagation of Chriſtian knowledge [e]. And leaſt the faults that were to be found in ſeveral places of the Latin tranſlation of the ſcriptures ſhould prove an obſtacle to the execution and accompliſhment of his pious views, he employed ALCUIN in correcting theſe errors, and is ſaid, in the laſt years of his life, to have ſpent a conſiderable part of his time in the ſame learned and pious work [f]. It is alſo to his encouragement and direction, that ſome writers attribute the firſt German tranſlation of the ſacred writings, though others contend, that this honour is due to his ſon and ſucceſſor LEWIS, ſurnamed the MEEK.

---

[z] See, for an account of the commentaries of BEDE, RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſiaſt. de M.* DU PIN, tom i. p. 280. See alſo BEDÆ *Explicatio Geneſeos ex patribus in* MARTENE's *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 111. 116. 140. and his interpretation of *Habakkuk*, ibid. p. 295.

[a] See CAROLUS *Magnus de Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

[b] See the ſame imperial author, book I. p. 84. 91. 123. 127. 131. 133. 136. 138. 145. 160. 164, 165, &c.

[c] Id. *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 231. 236.

[d] JO. FRICKIUS *De Canone Scripturæ Sacræ*, p. 184.

[e] BARONIUS *Annal. ad.* A. DCCLXXVIII. n. XXVII. JO. A. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. JAC. USSERIUS, *De ſacris et ſcripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

[f] J. A. FABRICII *Bibl. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. USSERIUS, *De ſacris et ſcripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

Miſſes its aim, by ſome imprudent appointments of that emperor.

V. This zeal and induſtry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouze from their ſloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raiſe up a ſpirit of application to literary purſuits. We cannot, however, help obſerving, that this laborious prince imprudently eſtabliſhed certain cuſtoms, and confirmed others, which had a manifeſt tendency to defeat, in a great meaſure, his laudable deſigns of promoting Chriſtian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in uſe, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public aſſemblies, certain portions only of the ſcriptures; and reduced the different methods of worſhip followed in different churches into one fixed rule, which was to be obſerved with the moſt perfect uniformity in all [g]. Perſuaded alſo that few of the clergy were capable of explaining with perſpicuity and judgment the portions of ſcripture, which are diſtinguiſhed in the ritual by the name of epiſtle and goſpel, he ordered PAUL DEACON, and ALCUIN to compile, from the ancient doctors of the church, *homilies*, or diſcourſes upon the epiſtles and goſpels, which a ſtupid and ignorant ſet of prieſts were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave riſe to that famous collection, which went by the title of the *homiliarium of Charlemagne* [h], and which being followed as a model by many productions of the ſame kind compoſed by private perſons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nouriſh the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthleſs clergy [i]. The zeal and activity of this great prince did not ſtop here;

---

[g] They who imagine that the portions of ſcripture which are ſtill explained, every year, to Chriſtians in their religious aſſemblies, were ſelected for that purpoſe by the order of CHARLEMAGNE, are undoubtedly miſtaken; ſince it is manifeſt, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of ſcripture ſet apart for each day of worſhip in the greateſt part of the Latin churches. See JO. HENRI THAMERI *Schediaſma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epiſtolæ vulgo vocantur*. See alſo J. FRANC. BUDDEI *Iſagoge ad Theologiam*, tom ii. p. 1640. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that CHARLEMAGNE introduced ſome new regulations into this part of divine ſervice; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in ſeveral circumſtances of the public worſhip, and particularly in this, that the ſame portions of ſcripture were not red and explained in them all, he publiſhed a ſolemn edict, commanding all the religious aſſemblies within his territories to conform themſelves to the rule of worſhip and divine ſervice eſtabliſhed in the *church of Rome*. With reſpect to the portions of ſcripture, which we call the *epiſtles* and *goſpels*, and which, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE down to us, continue to be uſed in divine worſhip, it is certain that they were red in the church of *Rome* ſo early as the ſixth century. It is alſo certain, that this prince was extremely careful in reforming the ſervice of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worſhip uſed at *Rome* to be obſerved in them all. Hence the churches, which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different *epiſtles* and *goſpels* from thoſe which are uſed by us and the other weſtern churches, who were commanded by CHARLEMAGNE to imitate the Roman ſervice. The church of *Corbetta* is an example of this, as may be ſeen in MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 836; and alſo the church of *Milan*, which follows the rite of St. AMBROSE. If any are deſirous to know what *epiſtles* and *goſpels* were uſed by the Francs and other weſtern churches before the time of CHARLEMAGNE, they have only to conſult the *Calendars* publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 66. the *Diſcourſes* of BEDE, publiſhed in the ſame work, *tom.* v. p. 339. and MABILLON, *De Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana*; to all which may be added PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle du Roi de France*, p. 566.

[h] See, for an account of this book of *Homilies*, the learned SEELEN's *Selecta Litteraria*, p. 252.

[i] ALAN, abbot of *Farſa* in *Italy*, wrote in this century an enormous *Book of Homilies*, the Preface to which is publiſhed by BERNARD PEZIUS, in the *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. vi. part. I. p. 83. In the following age ſeveral works under the ſame title were compoſed by learned men; one by HAGMO, of *Halberſtadt*, which is ſtill extant; another by RABANUS MAURUS, at the requeſt of the emperor LOTHAIRE; and a third by HERICUS, mentioned by PEZIUS in the work above

for he ordered the lives of the principal ſaints, to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were diſperſed throughout his dominions, that the people might have in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All theſe projects and deſigns were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, conſidering the ſtate of things in this century, were, in ſeveral reſpects, both uſeful and neceſſary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the prieſts in their criminal ſloth, and their ſhameful neglect of the ſtudy of the ſcriptures. For the greateſt part of them employed their time and labour only upon thoſe parts of the ſacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be red in the churches and explained to the people; and never attempted to exerciſe their capacities upon the reſt of the divine word. The greateſt part of the clergy alſo, inſtead of compoſing themſelves the diſcourſes they recited in public, confined themſelves to their book of homilies, that was publiſhed by the authority of their ſovereign, and thus let their talents lie uncultivated and unemployed.

The ſtate of didactic theology.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprizes ſo far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate ſyſtem of the various doctrines of Chriſtianity. It would be abſurd to comprehend under this title the various diſcourſes concerning the perſon and nature of CHRIST, which were deſigned to refute the errors of FELIX [*k*] and ELIPAND, or to combat the opinions, which were now ſpread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghoſt [*l*], and ſeveral other points; ſince theſe diſcourſes afford no proofs either of preciſion or diligence in their authors. The labours and induſtry of the divines of this age were totally employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the *fathers*, by whom are meant the theological writers of the firſt ſix centuries; and ſo blind and ſervile was their veneration for theſe doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reaſon was not permitted to puſh its reſearches. The Iriſh or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of *Scots*, were the only divines who refuſed to diſhonour their reaſon by ſubmitting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally ſubtile and ſagacious, they applied their philoſophy, ſuch as it was, to the illuſtration of the truths and doctrines of religion; a method which was almoſt generally abhorred and exploded in all other nations [*m*].

---

quoted, *p* 93. All theſe were wrote in Latin. The famous OTTFRID, of *Weiſſenbourg*, was the firſt who compoſed a *Book of Homilies* in the Teutonic language; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, ſee LAMBECIUS, *De Bibliotheca Vindobon. Auguſta*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

[(*k*) The doctrine taught by FELIX, biſhop of *Urgella*, and his diſciple ELIPAND, archbiſhop of *Toledo*, was, that JESUS CHRIST was the ſon of God not by *nature*, but by *adoption*. This doctrine was alſo intimately connected with the Neſtorian hypotheſis, and was condemned, in this century, by the ſynod of *Ratisſbon*, and the councils of *Francfort* and *Frioul*.]

[(*l*) The error now publiſhed relating to the *Holy Ghoſt* was, that *It* proceeded from the father *only*, and not from the father and the ſon.]

[*m*] That the Hibernians, who were called *Scots* in this century, were lovers of learning, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves, in theſe times of ignorance, by the culture of the ſciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the moſt diſtant lands both with a view to improve and

The Greeks were not ſo deſtitute of ſyſtematical divines as the Latins. JOHN DAMASCENUS compoſed a complete body of the Chriſtian doctrine in a ſcientifical method, under the title of *Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith*. The two kinds of *Theology*, which the Latins termed *ſcholaſtic* and *didactic*, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by ſubtile and profound reaſoning, but alſo confirms his explications by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the higheſt applauſe, and was ſo exceſſively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having conſulted more, in his theological ſyſtem, the conjectures of human reaſon, and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the ſacred oracles, and of having, in conſequence of this method, deviated from the true ſource and the eſſential principles of theology [n]. To the work of DAMASCENUS now mentioned we may add his *Sacred Parallels*, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and induſtry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning the various points of the Chriſtian religion. We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the THOMAS and LOMBARD of the Greeks.

Moral writers.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted forming a complete ſyſtem of the duties and virtues of the Chriſtian life. JOHN, ſurnamed CARPATHIUS, a Greek writer, compoſed ſome *exhortatory diſcourſes*, in which there are ſcarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monaſtic

---

to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we ſee them, in the moſt authentic records of antiquity, diſcharging, with the higheſt reputation and applauſe, the function of doctors in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, both during this and the following century. But that theſe Hibernians were the firſt teachers of the *ſcholaſtic theology* in *Europe*, and ſo early as the eighth century illuſtrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philoſophy, I learned but lately from the teſtimony of BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in the province of *Languedoc*, who lived in this period, and ſome of whoſe productions are publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in the fifth volume of his *Miſcellanea*. This learned abbot, in his *Letter to Guarnanius*, p. 54. expreſſes himſelf thus: "Apud modernos ſcholaſticos (*i. e.* public teachers, or ſchool-maſters) maxime apud SCOTOS eſt "ſyllogiſmus deluſionis, ut dicant, Trinitatem, ſicut perſonarum, ita eſſe ſubſtantiarum;" (by this it appears, that the Iriſh divines made uſe of a certain ſyllogiſm, which BENEDICT calls *deluſive*, i. e. fallacious and ſophiſtical, to demonſtrate that the *perſons* in the God-head were *ſubſtances*: a captious ſyllogiſm this, as we may ſee from what follows, and alſo every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greateſt perplexity) "quatinus ſi adſenſerit illectus auditor, Trinitatem eſſe trium "ſubſtantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: ſi autem abnuerit, perſonarum denegator culpetur." It was with this miſerable piece of ſophiſtry, that theſe ſubtile divines puzzled and tormented their diſciples and hearers, accuſing thoſe of *Tritheiſm*, who admitted their argument, and caſting the reproach of *Sabellianiſm* upon thoſe who rejected it. For thus they reaſoned, or rather quibbled; "You muſt either affirm or deny that the Three Perſons in the Deity are Three Sub"ſtances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a *Tritheite*, and worſhip Three Gods: if you deny "it, this denial implies that they are not three diſtinct perſons, and thus you fall into *Sabellianiſm*." BENEDICT condemns this Hibernian ſubtility, and ſeverely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he alſo recommends in its place that amiable ſimplicity that is ſo conformable to the nature and genius of the goſpel: "Sed hæc de fide (ſays he) et omnis calliditatis verſutia ſim"plicitate fidei catholicæ eſt puritate vitanda, non captioſa interjectione linguarum, ſcæva impac"tione interpolanda." From hence it appears, that the philoſophical or ſcholaſtic theology among the Latins is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

[n] JO. HENR. HOTTINGER. *Bibliothecar. Quadripart.* lib. iii. cap. ii. § 3. p. 372. MART. CHEMNITIUS, *De uſu et utilitate Locor. Commun.* p. 26.

orders nothing was reliſhed, but the enthuſiaſtic ſtrains of the Myſtics, and the doctrines of Dionysius the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whoſe ſuppoſititious writings were interpreted and explained by Johannes Darensis out of complaiſance to the monks [*o*]. The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to ſome general precepts concerning virtue and vice, that ſeemed rather deſtined to regulate the external actions of Chriſtians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts alſo, ſuch as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a ſtrong tincture of the Peripatetic philoſophy, as appears from certain treatiſes of Bede, and the *treatiſe* of Alcuin, *concerning virtue and vice* [*p*]. That the people, however, might be animated to the purſuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, Bede, Florus, Alcuin, Marcellinus, Ambrose Authpert, and others employed their pious induſtry in writing the lives of ſuch as had been eminent for their piety, and worthy deeds.

Controverſies.

VIII. The controverſies that turned upon the main and eſſential points of religion were, during this century, few in number, and ſcarcely any of them managed with tolerable ſagacity or judgment. The greateſt part of the Greeks were involved in the diſpute concerning images, in which their reaſonings were utterly deſtitute of preciſion and perſpicuity; while the Latins employed their chief zeal and induſtry in confuting and extirpating the doctrine of Elipand concerning the perſon of Christ. John Damascenus expoſed the errors of all the different ſects in a ſhort, but uſeful and intereſting, treatiſe; he alſo attacked the Manichæans and Neſtorians with a particular vehemence, and even went ſo far in his polemic labours as to combat the erroneous doctrine of the Saracens. In theſe compoſitions we find ſeveral proofs of ſubtilty and genius, but very little of that clearneſs and ſimplicity that conſtitute the chief merit of polemic writings. The Jews were left almoſt unmoleſted, as the Chriſtians were ſufficiently employed by the controverſies that had ariſen among themſelves: Anastasius, abbot of *Paleſtine*, made, however, ſome attempts to ſubdue the infidelity of that obſtinate people.

The origin of the diſpute concerning the worſhip of images.

IX. Of all the controverſies which agitated and perplexed the Chriſtian church during this century, that which aroſe concerning the worſhip of images in *Greece*, and was carried from thence into both the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, was the moſt unhappy and pernicious in its conſequences. The firſt ſparks of this terrible flame, that had like to have proved fatal both to the intereſts of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of Philippicus Bardanes, who was created emperor of the Greeks a little after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the conſent of John patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, ordered a picture, which repreſented the ſixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of St. *Sophia* A. D. 712; becauſe this council had condemned the

---

[*o*] Jos. Simon Assemani *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 129.

[*p*] This treatiſe is extant in the works of Alcuin, publiſhed by Quercetanus, tom. ii. p. 1218.

Monothelites, whoſe cauſe the emperor eſpouſed with the greateſt ardor and vehemence. Nor did BARDANES ſtop here; but ſent immediately an order to *Rome* to remove all images of that nature from the churches and other places of worſhip. His orders, however, were far from being received with ſubmiſſion, or producing their deſigned effect; on the contrary, CONSTANTINE, the Roman pontif, not only rejected, by a formal proteſt, the imperial edict, but, reſolved to expreſs his contempt of it by his actions as well as his words; he ordered ſix pictures, repreſenting the ſix general councils, to be placed in the porch of *St. Peter's* church; and, that no act of rebellion or arrogance might be left unemployed, he aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which he cauſed the emperor himſelf to be condemned as an apoſtate from the true religion. Theſe firſt tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, the year following, deprived BARDANES of the imperial throne [*q*].

Its progreſs under Leo the Iſaurian.

X. The diſpute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under LEO the Iſaurian, a prince of the greateſt reſolution and intrepidity, and the new tumults it excited were both violent and durable. LEO, unable to bear any longer the exceſſive height to which the Greeks carried their ſuperſtitious attachment to the worſhip of images, and the ſharp railleries and ſerious reproaches, which this idolatrous ſervice drew upon the Chriſtians from the Jews and Saracens, determined, by the moſt vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpoſe he iſſued out an edict, A. D. 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worſhip of images ſhould be abrogated and relinquiſhed, but alſo that all the images, except that of CHRIST's crucifixion, ſhould be removed out of the churches [*r*]. In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulſe of his natural character, which was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of prudence, which avoids precipitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and deſtroys and mines inveterate ſuperſtitions rather by ſlow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent aſſaults. The imperial edict produced ſuch effects, as might have been expected from the frantic enthuſiaſm of a ſuperſtitious people. A civil war broke out in the iſlands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of *Aſia*, and afterwards reached *Italy*. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in conſequence of the perfidious ſuggeſtions of the prieſts and monks, who had artfully rendered the worſhip of images a ſource of opulence to their churches and cloiſters, were led to regard the emperor as an apoſtate, and hence they conſidered themſelves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations that attach ſubjects to their lawful ſovereign.

[*q*] See FRED. SPANHEMII *Hiſtoria imaginum reſtituta*, which is publiſhed in the ſecond volume of his works, and alſo printed apart. MAIMBOURG'S Hiſtory of this controverſy, which is full of the moſt abſurd and malignant fictions. MURATORI *Annali d' Italia*, tom. iv. p. 221.

[(*r*) In this account of the imperial edict, Dr. MOSHEIM follows the opinions of BARONIUS, FLEURY, and LE SUEUR. Others affirm, with more probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where and caſting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worſhip. It would ſeem as if LEO was not, at firſt, averſe to the uſe of images, as ornaments, or even as helps, to devotion and memory; for at the ſame time that he forbid them to be worſhiped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, ſay ſome, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occaſion of idolatry, he had them removed from the churches and broken.]

The conteſts between the partiſans of images, who were called *Iconoduli*, and their oppoſers, who were called *Iconoclaſtæ*.

XI. The Roman pontiſs GREGORY I and II were the authors and ringleaders of theſe civil commotions and inſurrections in *Italy*. The former, upon the emperor's refuſing to revoke his edict againſt images, declared him, without heſitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Chriſtian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no ſooner was this formidable ſentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian provinces, that were ſubject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and riſing in arms either maſſacred or baniſhed all the emperor's deputies and officers. LEO exaſperated by theſe inſolent proceedings, reſolved to chaſtiſe the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontif feel, in a particular manner, the effects of his reſentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this diſappointment, he vented his fury againſt images, and their worſhipers, in the year 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, he degraded from his office GERMANUS, the biſhop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put ANASTASIUS in his place, ordered all the images to be publicly burnt, and inflicted a variety of ſevere puniſhments upon ſuch as were attached to that idolatrous worſhip. Theſe rigorous meaſures divided the Chriſtian church into two violent factions, whoſe conteſts were carried on with an ungoverned rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and aſſaſſinations. Of theſe factions the one adopted the adoration and worſhip of images, and were on that account called *Iconoduli* or *Iconolatræ*; while the other maintained that ſuch worſhip was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Chriſtians than to demoliſh and deſtroy thoſe ſtatues and pictures, that were the occaſions and objects of this groſs idolatry, and hence they were diſtinguiſhed by the titles of *Iconomachi* and *Iconoclaſtæ*. The furious zeal, which GREGORY II had ſhewn in defending the odious ſuperſtition of image-worſhip, was not only imitated, but even ſurpaſſed by his ſucceſſor, who was the III^d pontif of that name; and though, at this diſtance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumſtances that attended the intemperate zeal of theſe inſolent prelates, yet we know with the utmoſt certainty, that it was owing to their extravagant attachment to image-worſhip that the Italian provinces were torn from the Grecian empire [*s*].

[*s*] The Greek writers tell us, that both the GREGORIES carried their inſolence ſo far as to excommunicate LEO and his ſon CONSTANTINE, to diſſolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of *Italy* had taken to theſe princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or ſhewing them any marks of ſubmiſſion and obedience. Theſe facts are alſo acknowledged by many of the partiſans of the Roman pontifs, ſuch as BARONIUS, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiæ*, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, ſome learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate conſiderably the crime of the GREGORIES, and poſitively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors abovementioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See LAUNOIUS, *Epiſtolar.* lib. vii. *Ep.* vii. p. 456. tom. v. Opp. part. II. NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. Capit.* Sæc. viii. Diſſert. i. p. 456. PETR. de MARCA, *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. iii. cap. xi. BOSSUET, *Defenſ. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de poteſtate Eccleſ.* part. I. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197. GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire Civile de Naples*, tom. i. p. 400. All

Their progreſs under Conſtantine Copronymus.

XII. Constantine, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worſhipers had given by way of deriſion the name of Copronymus [t], ſucceeded his father Leo in the empire A. D. 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour againſt the new idolatry, employed all his influence in extirpating and aboliſhing the worſhip of images in oppoſition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontifs, and the ſuperſtitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the meaſures purſued by Leo; for, knowing the reſpect which the Greeks had for the deciſions of general councils, whoſe authority they conſidered as ſupreme and unlimited in religious matters, he aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 754, a council compoſed of the eaſtern biſhops, in order to have this important queſtion examined with the utmoſt care, and decided with wiſdom, ſeconded by a juſt and lawful authority. This aſſembly, which the Greeks, regard as the *ſeventh oecumenical council*, gave judgment, as was the cuſtom of thoſe times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and ſolemnly condemned the worſhip and alſo the uſe of images [u]. But this deciſion was not ſufficient to vanquiſh the blind obſtinacy of ſuperſtition; many adhered ſtill to their idolatrous worſhip, and none made a more turbulent reſiſtance to the wiſe decree of this council than the monks, who ſtill continued to excite commotions in the ſtate, and to blow the flames of ſedition and rebellion among the people. Their malignity was, however, chaſtiſed by Constantine, who, filled with a juſt indignation at their ſeditious practices, puniſhed ſeveral of them in an exemplary manner, and by new laws ſet bounds to the violence of monaſtic rage. Leo IV, who, after the death of Constantine, was declared emperor A. D. 775, adopted the ſentiments of his father and grandfather, and purſued the meaſures which they had concerted for the extirpation of idolatry out of the Chriſtian church; for having perceived that the worſhipers of images could not be engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon this ſuperſtitious practice, he had recourſe to the coercive influence of penal laws.

Under Irene.

XIII. A cup of poiſon, adminiſtred by the impious counſel of a perfidious ſpouſe, deprived Leo IV of his life A. D. 780, and rendered the idolatrous cauſe of images triumphant. The profligate Irene, after having thus accompliſhed the death of her huſband, held the reins of empire during the

---

theſe found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the Gregories, chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, ſuch as Anastasius, Paul Deacon, and others, who ſeem to have known nothing of that audacious inſolence, with which theſe pontifs are ſaid to have oppoſed the emperors, and even repreſent them as having given ſeveral marks of their ſubmiſſion and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the moſt prudent uſe we can make of them is, to ſuſpend our judgment with reſpect to a matter, which the obſcurity that covers the hiſtory of this period, renders it impoſſible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontifs abovementioned for the worſhip of images, furniſhed to the people of *Italy* the occaſion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

[(*t*) This nick-name was given to Constantine, from his having defiled the ſacred font at his baptiſm.]

[(*u*) The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholics, no more than the obligation of the *ſecond commandment*, which they have *prudently* ſtruck out of the decalogue.]

minority of her ſon CONSTANTINE; and, to eſtabliſh her authority on more ſolid foundations, entered into an alliance with ADRIAN, biſhop of *Rome*, A. D. 786; ſummoned a council at *Nice* in *Bithynia*, which is known by the title of the *ſecond Nicene council*. In this aſſembly the imperial laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the council of *Conſtantinople* reverſed, the worſhip of images and of the croſs reſtored, and ſevere puniſhments denounced againſt ſuch as maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. It is impoſſible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and trifling than the arguments, upon which the biſhops, aſſembled in this council, founded their decrees [*w*]. The authority, however, of theſe decrees was held ſacred by the Romans, and the Greeks conſidered in the light of parricides and traitors all ſuch as refuſed to ſubmit to them. The other enormities of the flagitious IRENE, and her deſerved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treated of here.

The council of Francfort.

XIV. In theſe violent conteſts, the moſt of the Latins, ſuch as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, ſeemed to ſteer a middle way between the oppoſite tenets of the contending parties. They were of opinion that images might be lawfully preſerved, and even placed in the churches, but, at the ſame time, they looked upon all worſhip of them as highly injurious and offenſive to the ſupreme being [*x*]. Such, particularly, were the ſentiments of CHARLEMAGNE, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this important controverſy. By the advice of the French biſhops, who were no friends to this ſecond council of *Nice*, he ordered ſome learned and judicious divine to compoſe *Four Books concerning images*, which he ſent, in the year 790, to ADRIAN, the Roman pontif, with a view to engage him to withdraw his approbation of the decrees of that council. In this performance the reaſons alledged by the *Nicene* biſhops to juſtify the worſhip of images, are refuted with great accuracy and ſpirit [*y*]. They were not, however, left without defence; ADRIAN, who was afraid of acknowledging even an emperor for his maſter, compoſed an anſwer to the *Four Books* mentioned above, but neither his arguments, nor his authority, were ſufficient to ſupport the ſuperſtition he endeavoured to maintain; for, in the year 794, CHARLEMAGNE aſſembled, at *Francfort* on the *Maine*, a council of three hundred biſhops, in order to re-examine this important queſtion; in which the opinion contained in the *Four Books* was ſolemnly confirmed, and the worſhip of images unanimouſly condemned [z]. From hence we may conclude, that in this century the Latins deemed it neither impious, nor unlawful, to diſſent from the opinion of the Roman pontif, and even to charge that prelate with error.

[*w*] MART. CHEMNITIUS, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, part. iv. loc. ii. cap. v. p. 52. LENFANT, *Preſervatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome*, part. iii. lettre xvii. p. 446.

[*x*] The averſion the Britons had to the worſhip of images may be ſeen in SPELMAN *ad Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 73.

[*y*] The books of CHARLEMAGNE *concerning Images*, which deſerve an attentive peruſal, are yet extant; and when they were become extremely ſcarce, were republiſhed at *Hanover* in 8vo in 1731, by the celebrated CHRISTOPHER. AUG. HEUMAN, who enriched this edition with a learned Preface. Theſe books are adorned with the venerable name of CHARLEMAGNE; but it is eaſy to perceive that they are the production of a ſcholaſtic divine, and not of an emperor. Several learned men have conjectured, that CHARLEMAGNE compoſed theſe books with the aſſiſtance of his preceptor ALCUIN; ſee HEUMANNI *Præf.* p. 51. and BUNAU *Hiſtoria Imperii German.* tom. i. p. 490. This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be admitted without heſitation; ſince ALCUIN was in *England* when theſe books were compoſed. We learn from the hiſtory of his life, that he went into *England* A. D. 789, and did not return from thence before 792.

The controverſy about the derivation of the Holy Ghoſt.

XV. While the controverſy concerning images was at its height, a new conteſt aroſe among the Latins and Greeks about the ſource from whence the Holy Ghoſt *proceeded*. The Latins affirmed, that this divine ſpirit proceeded from the father and the ſon; the Greeks, on the contrary, aſſerted, that it proceeded from the father only. The origin of this controverſy is covered with perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it was agitated in the council of *Gentilli*, near *Paris*, A. D. 767, in preſence of the emperor's legates [a], and from this we may conclude, with a high degree of probability, that it aroſe in *Greece* at that time when the conteſt about images was carried on with the greateſt vehemence. In this controverſy the Latins alledged, in favour of their opinion, the creed of *Conſtantinople*, which the Spaniards and French had ſucceſſively corrupted (upon what occaſion is not well known) by adding the words *filioque* in that part of it which contained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghoſt. The Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifeſt interpolation a creed, which ſerved as a rule of doctrine for the church univerſal, and declared this attempt impudent and ſacrilegious. Thus the diſpute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated word above mentioned [b]: in the following century it was carried on with ſtill greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the diſſenſions which already portended a ſchiſm between the eaſtern and weſtern churches [c].

---

[z] This event is treated with a degree of candour not more laudable, than ſurprizing, by MABILLON, *in Præf. ad Sæculum* iv. *Actorum SS. Ord. Benedict.* part. V. See alſo JO. GEORG. DORSCHEUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofordienſe*, *Argentor*. 1649. in 4to.

[a] See LE COINTE *Annales Eccleſ. Francorum*, tom. v. p. 698.

[b] Learned men generally imagine that this controverſy began about the word *filioque*, which ſome of the Latins had added to the Creed that had been drawn up by the council of *Conſtantinople*, and that from the *word* the diſpute proceeded to the *doctrine* itſelf; ſee MABILLON, *Act. Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* iv. part: I. *Præf.* p. iv. who is followed by many in this opinion. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the firſt ſubject of controverſy, which afterwards extended to the word *filioque*, conſidered by the Greeks as a manifeſt interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of *Gentilli* ſhews evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a conſiderable time, the ſubject of controverſy, when the diſpute aroſe about the word now mentioned. PAGI, in his *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. p. 323. is of opinion, that this controverſy had both its date and its occaſion from the diſpute concerning images: for when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their oppoſition to image-worſhip, the Greeks, in their turn, charged the Latins alſo with hereſy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghoſt proceeded from the father and the ſon. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without ſufficient proof, and we muſt therefore conſider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

[c] See PITHOEI *Hiſt. controv. de proceſſione Spiritus S.* at the end of his *Codex Canon. Eccleſ. Roman.* p. 355. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. iii. p. 354. GER. J. VOSSIUS, *De Tribus Symbolis, Diſſ.* iii. p. 65; and above all, JO. GEORG. WALCHIUS, *Hiſtor. controv. de proceſſione Spiritus S.* publiſhed in 8vo at *Jena* in 1751.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. THE religion of this century conſiſted almoſt entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating theſe outward marks of a ſuperſtitious devotion, than in correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their underſtandings and forming their hearts. The adminiſtration of the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, which was deemed the moſt ſolemn and important branch of divine worſhip, was now every where embelliſhed, or rather deformed, with a variety of ſenſeleſs fopperies, which deſtroyed the beautiful ſimplicity of that affecting and ſalutary inſtitution. We alſo find manifeſt traces in this century of that ſuperſtitious cuſtom of celebrating what were called *ſolitary maſſes* [*d*], though it be difficult to decide whether they were inſtituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private perſons [*e*]. Be that as it may, this ſingle cuſtom is ſufficient to give us an idea of the ſuperſtition and darkneſs that ſat brooding over the Chriſtian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unneceſſary to enter into a further detail of the abſurd rites with which a deſigning prieſthood continued to disfigure the religion of JESUS.

Charlemagne's zeal for the rites of the church of *Rome*.

II. CHARLEMAGNE ſeemed diſpoſed to ſtem this torrent of ſuperſtition, which gathered force from day to day; for not to mention the zeal with which he oppoſed the worſhip of images, there are other circumſtances that bear teſtimony to his intentions in this matter, ſuch as his preventing the multiplication of feſtivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of conſecrating the church-bells by the rite of holy aſperſion, and other eccleſiaſtical laws of his enacting, which redound to his honour. Several circumſtances, however, concurred to render his deſigns abortive, and to blaſt the ſucceſs of his worthy purpoſes, and none more than his exceſſive attachment to the Roman pontifs, who were the patrons and protectors of thoſe who exerted themſelves in the cauſe of ceremonies. This vehement paſſion for the lordly pontif was inherited by the great prince, of whom we are now ſpeaking, from his father PEPIN, who had already commanded the manner of ſinging, and the kind of church-muſic in uſe at *Rome* to be obſerved every where in all Chriſtian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate ſollicitation of the pontif ADRIAN, that CHARLEMAGNE laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model, the church of *Rome*, not only in the article now mentioned, but alſo in the whole form of their worſhip,

---

[(*d*) *Solitary* or *private maſſes* were thoſe that were celebrated by the prieſt alone in behalf of ſouls detained in purgatory, as well as upon ſome other particular occaſions. Theſe maſſes were prohibited by the laws of the church, but they were a rich ſource of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a ſynod aſſembled at *Mentz* under CHARLEMAGNE, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and ſloth.]

[*e*] See CHARLEMAGNE's book *concerning Images*, p. 245; as alſo GEORGE CALIXTUS, *De Miſſis Solitariis*, § 12.

worſhip, in every circumſtance of their religious ſervice [*f*]. Several churches however, among which thoſe of *Milan* and *Corbetta*, diſtinguiſhed themſelves eminently, abſolutely rejected this propoſal, and could neither be brought by perſuaſion nor violence to change their uſual method of worſhip.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

The ancient ſects recover ſtrength.

I. THE Arians, Manicheans, and Marchionites, though often depreſſed by the force of penal laws and the power of the ſecular arm, gathered ſtrength in the eaſt amidſt the tumults and diviſions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profeſſion of their opinions [*g*]. The Monothelites, to whoſe cauſe the emperor **Philippicus**, and many others of the firſt rank and dignity were moſt zealous well-wiſhers, regained their credit in ſeveral places. The condition alſo of both the Neſtorians and Monophyſites was eaſy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence was conſiderable; nor were they deſtitute of means of weakening the Greeks their irreconcileable adverſaries, and of ſpreading their doctrines, and multiplying every where the number of their adherents.

Clemens and Adalbert.

II. In the church which **Boniface** had newly erected in *Germany*, he himſelf tells us, that there were many perverſe and erroneous reprobates, who had no true notion of religion, and his friends and adherents confirm this aſſertion. But the teſtimony both of the one and the others is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit; ſince it appears from the moſt evident proofs, that the perſons here accuſed of errors and hereſies were Iriſh and French divines, who refuſed that blind ſubmiſſion to the church of *Rome*, which **Boniface** was ſo zealous to propagate every where. **Adalbert** a Gaul, and **Clement** a native of *Ireland*, were the perſons whoſe oppoſition gave the moſt trouble to the ambitious legate. The former got himſelf conſecrated biſhop without the conſent of **Boniface**, excited ſeditions and tumults among the eaſtern Francs, and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct and erroneous in his opinions [*h*]; among other irregularities he was the forger of a letter to the human race, which was ſaid to have been written by **Jesus Christ**, and to have been carried from heaven by the arch-angel **Michael** [*i*]. As to **Clement**, his character and ſentiments were maliciouſly miſrepreſented, ſince it appears by the beſt and moſt authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Chriſtianity than BONIFACE himſelf; and hence he is conſidered by many as a confeſſor and ſufferer for the truth in this barbarous age [*k*]. Be that as it will, both ADALBERT and CLEMENT were condemned at the inſtigation of BONIFACE, by the pontif ZACHARY, in a council aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 748 [*l*], and in conſequence thereof were committed to priſon, where, in all probability, they concluded their days.

[*f*] See **Charlemagne**'s *Treatiſe concerning Images*, book I. p. 52. **Eginard**, *De vita Caroli Magni*, cap. 26. p. 94. edit. *Beſſelii*.

[*g*] In *Europe* alſo Arianiſm prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Chriſtian faith.

[*h*] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 82.

[*i*] There is an edition of this letter publiſhed by the learned **Stephen Baluzius**, in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. ii. p. 1396.

Felix and Elipand.

III. Religious diſcord ran ſtill higher in *Spain*, *France*, and *Germany* towards the concluſion of this century, and the moſt unhappy tumults and commotions were occaſioned by a queſtion propoſed to FELIX, biſhop of *Urgella*, by ELIPAND, arch-biſhop of *Toledo*, who deſired to know *in what ſenſe* CHRIST *was* the ſon of God? The anſwer which the former gave to this queſtion, was, that CHRIST, conſidered in his divine nature, was *truly* and *eſſentially* the ſon of God, but that conſidered as a man, he was only ſo, *nominally* and *by adoption*. This doctrine was ſpred abroad by the two prelates; ELIPAND propagated it in the different provinces of *Spain*, and FELIX throughout *Septimania*, while the pontif ADRIAN, and the greateſt part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Neſtorian hereſy, by its repreſenting CHRIST as divided into two diſtinct perſons. In conſequence of this, FELIX was ſucceſſively condemned by the councils of *Narbonne*, *Ratiſbon*, *Francfort* on the *Main*, and *Rome*, and was finally obliged, by the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, to retract his error, and to change his opinion [*m*]. The change he made was, however, rather nominal, than real, the common ſhift of temporizing divines; for he ſtill retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at *Lyons*, where he had been baniſhed by CHARLEMAGNE [*n*]. ELIPAND, on the contrary, lived ſecure in *Spain* under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of ſynods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whoſe utmoſt efforts can go no further than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the diſciples of FELIX, who were called *Adoptians*, departed much leſs from the doctrine generally received among Chriſtians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly diſtinguiſhed their tenets was the term they uſed, and their manner of expreſſion, rather than a real diverſity of ſentiments [o]. But as this ſect, together with their chief, thought proper to make uſe of ſingular, and ſometimes of contradictory, expreſſions; this furniſhed ſuch as accuſed them of Neſtorianiſm, with very plauſible reaſons to ſupport their charge.

[*k*] We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of CLEMENT in the letters of BONIFACE *Epiſtol.* cxxxv. p. 189. See alſo USSERII *Sylloge Epiſtolarum Hibernicarum*, p. 12. NOUVEAU *Dictionnaire Hiſtor. Critic.* tom. i. p. 133. [The zealous BONIFACE was too ignorant to be a proper judge of hereſy, as appears by his condemning VIRGILIUS for believing that there were antipodes. The great hereſy of CLEMENT ſeems to have been his perferring the deciſions of ſcripture to decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.]

[(*l*) This is the true date of the council aſſembled by ZACHARY for the condemnation of ADALBERT and CLEMENT, and not the year 745, as FLEURY * and MABILLON † have pretended, in which error they are followed by Mr. BOWER, in the third volume of his *Hiſtory of the Popes*, p. 325. The proof is, that the letter of BONIFACE, in conſequence of which this council was aſſembled, muſt have been wrote in the year 748; ſince he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy ſee of *Rome*, into which commiſſion he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.]

[(*m*) The council of *Narbonne* that condemned FELIX, was held in the year 788, that of *Ratiſbon* in 792, that of *Francfort* in 794, that of *Rome* in 799.]

[*n*] The authors, who have written concerning the ſect of FELIX, are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 482. Add to theſe PETRUS de MARCA, in his *Marca Hiſpanica*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 368. JO. de FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire Generale d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 518. 523. 528. 535. 560. JO. MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, part. II. There are alſo very particular accounts given of FELIX by DOM. COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 79. and by the Benedictine monks in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 434.

* *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ix. p. 296. † *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* lib. xxii. n. 8.

[o] Jo. GEORGE DORSCHEUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofurt.* p. 101. WERENFELS, *De Logomachiis Eruditor.* p. 459. Opp. JAC. BASNAGIUS *Præf. ad Etherium in* HENR. CANISII *Lection. antiquis,* tom. ii. part. I. p. 284. GEORGE CALIXTUS, *Singul. Diſſ.*

THE

NINTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events, which happened to the church during this century.

CENT. IX.

The Swedes, Danes, and Cimbrians converted.

I. THE reign of CHARLEMAGNE had been ſingularly auſpicious to the Chriſtian cauſe; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the moſt zealous efforts to propagate and eſtabliſh the religion of JESUS among the Huns, Saxons, Frieſlanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, and his ſpiritual conqueſts were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarniſhes the luſtre of his nobleſt exploits. His ſon LEWIS, undeſervedly ſurnamed the MEEK, inherited the defects of his illuſtrious father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but vaſtly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accompliſhments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the goſpel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of *Sweden* and *Denmark*. A petty king of *Jutland*, named HARALD KLACK, being driven from both his kingdom and country, in the year 826, by REGNER LODBROCK, threw himſelf at the emperor's feet, and implored his ſuccours againſt the uſurper. LEWIS granted his requeſt, and promiſed the exiled prince his protection and aſſiſtance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Chriſtianity, and admit the miniſters of that religion to preach in his dominions. HARALD ſubmitted to theſe conditions, was baptized with his brother at *Mentz*, A. D. 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, ANSGAR OR ANSCHAIRE and AUTHBERT; the former a monk of *Corbey* in *Weſtphalia*, and the latter belonging to a monaſtery of the ſame name in *France*. Theſe venerable miſſionaries preached the goſpel with remarkable ſucceſs, during the ſpace of two years, to the inhabitants of *Cimbria* and *Jutland*.

The promotion and labours of Anſgar.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion AUTBERT, the zealous and indefatigable ANSGAR made a voyage into *Sweden*, A. D. 828, where his miniſterial labours were alſo crowned with a diſtinguiſhed ſucceſs. As he returned from thence into *Germany* in the year 831, he was loaded by LEWIS the MEEK with eccleſiaſtical honours, being created arch-biſhop of the new church at *Hamburgh*, and alſo of the whole north, to which dignity the ſuperintendence of the church of *Bremen* was afterwards added in the year 844. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconſiderable, while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly ANSGAR travelled frequently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cauſe of CHRIST, to form new churches, and to confirm and eſtabliſh thoſe which he had already gathered together; in all which arduous enterprizes he paſſed his life in the moſt imminent dangers, until he concluded his glorious courſe A. D. 865 [*a*].

Converſion of the Bulgarians, Bohemians, and Moravians.

III. About the middle of this century the Mœſians [*b*], Bulgarians, and Gazarians; and after them the Bohemians and Moravians were converted to Chriſtianity by METHODIUS and CYRIL, two Greek monks, whom the empreſs THEODORA had ſent to diſpel the darkneſs of thoſe idolatrous nations [*c*]. The zeal of CHARLEMAGNE, and his pious miſſionaries, had been formerly exerted in the ſame cauſe, and among the ſame people [*d*], but with ſo little ſucceſs, that any faint notions which they had received of the Chriſtian doctrine were entirely effaced. The inſtructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better and alſo a more permanent effect; but as they recommended to their new diſciples the forms of worſhip, and the various rites and ceremonies uſed among the Greeks [*e*], this was the occaſion of much religious animoſity and contention in after times, when the lordly pontifs exerted all their vehemence and employed every means, though with imperfect ſucceſs, of reducing theſe nations under the diſcipline and juriſdiction of the Latin church.

Of the Slavonians and Ruſſians.

IV. Under the reign of BASILIUS, the Macedonian, who aſcended the imperial throne of the Greeks in the year 867, the Slavonians, Arentani, and certain provinces of *Dalmatia*, ſent a ſolemn embaſſy to *Conſtantinople* to declare their reſolution of ſubmitting to the juriſdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the ſame time, the Chriſtian religion. This propoſal was received with admiration and joy, and it was alſo anſwered by a ſuitable ardour and zeal for the converſion of a people, which ſeemed ſo ingenuouſly diſpoſed to embrace the truth: accordingly a competent number of Grecian doctors were ſent among them to inſtruct them in the knowledge of the goſpel, and to admit them by baptiſm into the Chriſtian church [*f*]. The warlike nation of the Ruſſians were converted under the ſame emperor, but not in the ſame manner, nor from the ſame noble and rational motives. Having entered into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were engaged by various preſents and promiſes to embrace the goſpel, in conſequence of which they received not only the Chriſtian miniſters that were appointed to inſtruct them, but alſo an arch-biſhop, whom the Grecian patriarch IGNATIUS had ſent among them to perfect their converſion and to eſtabliſh their church [*g*]. Such were the beginnings of Chriſtianity among the bold and warlike Ruſſians, who were inhabitants of the *Ukraine*, and who, a little before their converſion, fitted out a formidable fleet, and ſetting ſail from *Kiovia* for *Conſtantinople*, ſpred terror and diſmay through the whole empire [*h*].

[*a*] The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illuſtrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Daniſh, and Swediſh churches, are mentioned by JO. ALBERT. FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. i p. 292. as alſo in his *Lux Evangelii orbi terrarum exoriens*, p. 425. Add to theſe the Benedictine monks, in their *Hiſtoire Litt de la France*, tom. v. p. 277. *Acta Sanctor. Menſ. Februar.* tom. i. p. 391. ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſ. Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom. i p. 18. JO. MÖLLERUS, *Cimbriæ Litteratæ*, tom. iii p. 8. Theſe writers give us alſo circumſtantial accounts of EBBO, WITHMAR, REMBERT, and others, who were either the fellow-labourers or ſucceſſors of ANSGAR.

[(*b*) We have tranſlated thus the term *Myſi*, which is an error in the original. Dr. MOSHEIM, like many others, has confounded the Myſians with the inhabitants of *Mœſia*, by giving the latter, who were Europeans, the title of the former, who dwelt in *Aſia*.]

[*c*] JO. GEORGE STREDOWSKY, *Sacra Moraviæ Hiſtoria*, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94. compared with PET. KOHLII *Introduc. in Hiſtoriam et rem. Litter. Slavorum*, p. 124.

[*d*] STREDOWSKY *loc. cit.* lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

[*e*] LENFANT, *Hiſtoire de la guerre des Huſſites*, livr. i. ch. i. p. 2.

The nature of theſe converſions.

V. It is proper to obſerve, with reſpect to the various converſions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than thoſe of the preceding ages. The miniſters, who were now ſent to inſtruct and convert the barbarous nations, employed not, like many of their predeceſſors, the terror of penal laws, to affright men into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity; nor, in eſtabliſhing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontifs: their views were more noble and their conduct more ſuitable, to the genius of the religion they profeſſed. They had principally in view the happineſs of mankind, endeavoured to promote the goſpel of truth and peace by the methods of a rational perſuaſion, and ſeconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being conformable to that pure and excellent rule of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour, and his holy apoſtles; their religious ſyſtem was, on the contrary, corrupted with a variety of ſuperſtitious rites and a multitude of abſurd inventions. It is further certain, that there remained among theſe converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their anceſtors, notwithſtanding the zealous labours of their Chriſtian guides; and it appears alſo that theſe pious miſſionaries were contented with introducing an external profeſſion of the true religion among their new proſelytes. It would be, however, unjuſt to accuſe them on this account of negligence or corruption in the diſcharge of their miniſtry, ſince, in order to gain over theſe fierce and ſavage nations to the church, it may have been abſolutely neceſſary to indulge them in ſome of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things, which they could not approve, and which, in other circumſtances, they would have been careful to correct.

[*f*] We are indebted for this account of the converſion of the Slavonians to the treatiſe *De adminiſtrando imperio*, compoſed by the learned emperor CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGEN. which is publiſhed by BANDURIUS in *Imperium Orientale*, tom. i. p. 72, 73. CONSTANTINE gives the ſame account of this event in the life of his grandfather BASILIUS the Macedonian, § 54. publiſhed in the *Corpus Byzantinum*, tom. xvi. p. 133, 134.

[*g*] CONSTANTINUS, *Porph. Vita Baſilii Macedonis*, § 96. p. 157. *Corp. Byzant.* See alſo the *Narratio de Ruthenorum Converſione*, publiſhed both in Greek and Latin by BANDURIUS, in his *Imperium Orientale*, *notis ad Porphyrogennetam de adminiſtrando imperio*, p. 62. tom. ii.

[*h*] The learned LEQUIEN, in his *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 1257. gives a very inaccurate account of theſe Ruſſians, who were converted to Chriſtianity under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote before him upon the ſame ſubject. Nor is he conſiſtent with himſelf; for in one place he affirms, that the people here ſpoken of were the Ruſſians, that lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians; while in another he maintains, that by theſe Ruſſians we are to underſtand the Gazarians. The only reaſon he alledges to ſupport this latter opinion is, that, among the Chriſtian doctors ſent to inſtruct the Ruſſians, mention is made of CYRIL, who converted the Gazari to Chriſtianity. This reaſon ſhews, that the learned writer had a moſt imperfect knowledge both of theſe Ruſſians and the Gazari. He is alſo guilty of other miſtakes upon the ſame ſubject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, in his *Diſſ. de Ruſſorum prima expeditione Conſtantinopolitana*, which is publiſhed in the ſixth volume of the *Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitanæ*.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamities which happened to the church during this century.

The progreſs of the Saracens towards univerſal empire.

I. THE Saracens had now extended their uſurpations with an amazing ſucceſs. Maſters of *Aſia*, a few provinces excepted, they puſhed their conqueſts to the extremities of *India*, and obliged the greateſt part of *Africa* to receive their yoke; nor were their enterprizes in the weſt without effect, ſince *Spain* and *Sardinia* ſubmitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conqueſts did not end here: for in the year 827, by the treaſon of Euphemius, they made themſelves maſters of the rich and fertile iſland of *Sicily*; and towards the concluſion of this century the Aſiatic Saracens ſeized upon ſeveral cities of *Calabria*, and ſpred the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of *Rome*, while *Crete*, *Corſica*, and other adjacent iſlands were either joined to their poſſeſſions, or laid waſte by their incurſions. It is eaſy to comprehend that this overgrown proſperity of a nation accuſtomed to bloodſhed and rapine, and which alſo beheld the Chriſtians with the utmoſt averſion, muſt have been every where detrimental to the progreſs of the goſpel, and to the tranquillity of the church. In the eaſt, more eſpecially, a prodigious number of Chriſtian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their poſſeſſions. Many, indeed, refuſed this baſe and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of perſecution; but ſuch were gradually reduced to a miſerable condition, and were not only robbed of the beſt part of their wealth, and deprived of their worldly advantages, but, what was ſtill more deplorable, they fell by degrees into ſuch incredible ignorance and ſtupidity, that, in proceſs of time, there were ſcarcely

ſcarcely any remains of Chriſtianity to be found among them beſides the mere name, and a few external rites and ceremonies. The European Saracens, particularly thoſe who were ſettled in *Spain*, were of a much milder diſpoſition, and ſeemed to have put off the greateſt part of their native ferocity; ſo that the Chriſtians, generally ſpeaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to obſerve the laws and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profeſſion. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without ſome few exceptions of cruelty [*i*].

The Normans.

II. The European Chriſtians had the moſt cruel ſufferings to undergo from another quarter, even from the inſatiable fury of a ſwarm of barbarians that iſſued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, whoſe habitations lay along the coaſts of the Baltic ſea, were a people accuſtomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs, who ſubſiſted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, infeſted with their fleets the coaſts of the German ocean, but were reſtrained by the oppoſition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterprizing, made frequent irruptions into *Germany*, *Britain*, *Frieſland*, and the Gauls, and carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and ſword, deſolation and horror. The impetuous fury of theſe ſavage barbarians not only ſpred deſolation through the *Spaniſh* provinces [*k*], but even penetrated into the very heart of *Italy*; for in the year 857, they ſacked and pillaged the city of *Luna* in the moſt cruel manner, and about three years after, *Piſa*, and ſeveral other cities of *Italy*, met with the ſame fate [*l*]. The ancient hiſtories of the Francs abound with the moſt diſmal accounts of their horrid exploits.

Form new ſettlements.

III. The firſt views of theſe ſavage invaders extended no further than plunder; but charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces, which they were ſo cruelly depopulating, they began to form ſettlements in them, nor were the European princes in a condition to oppoſe their uſurpations. On the contrary, CHARLES the BALD was obliged, in the year 850, to reſign a conſiderable part of his dominions to this powerful banditti [*m*]; and a few years after, under the reign of CHARLES the GROSS, emperor and king of *France*, the famous Norman chief GODOFRED entered with an army into *Frieſland*, and obſtinately refuſed to ſheath his ſword before he was maſter of the whole province [*n*]. Such, however, of the Normans as ſettled among the Chriſtians, contracted a gentler turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Chriſtians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors with more facility, and to embrace the goſpel with more readineſs, than they would have otherwiſe done. Thus the proud conqueror of *Frieſland* ſolemnly embraced the Chriſtian religion after that he had received in marriage, from CHARLES the GROSS, GISELA, the daughter of LOTHAIRE the younger.

[*i*] See, for example, the account that is given of EULOGIUS, who ſuffered martyrdom at *Cordoua*, in the *Acta Sanctorum ad d.* xi *Martii*, tom. ii. p. 88; as alſo of RODERICK and SALOMON, two Spaniſh martyrs of this century. Ibid. *ad d.* xiii *Martii*, p. 238.

[*k*] Jo. de FERRARAS, *Hiſtoire Gener. d'Eſpagne*, tom. ii. p. 583. Piracy was eſteemed among the northern nations a very honourable and noble profeſſion; and hence the ſons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this ſpecies of robbery, and made it their principal buſineſs to perfect themſelves in it. Nor will this appear very ſurprizing to ſuch as conſider the religion of theſe nations, and the barbariſm of the times. See JO. LUD. HOLBERG. *Hiſtoria Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis*, in *Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafnienſis*, tom. iii. p. 349. in which there are a multitude of curious and intereſting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Daniſh and Norwegian annals.

[*l*] See the *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, publiſhed by MURATORI.

[*m*] *Annales incerti Auctoris*, in PITHOEI *Scriptor. Francic.* p. 46.

[*n*] REGINONIS PRUMIENSIS *Annal.* lib. ii. f. 60. in PISTORII *Scriptor. German.*

PART

PART II.

The Internal History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

I. THE Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumſtances every way proper to extinguiſh all taſte for letters and philoſophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the ſciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, ſome of whom were men of learning and taſte, and the wiſe precautions taken by the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, among whom Photius deſerves the firſt rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus to prevent the total decline of letters. Accordingly we find in *Conſtantinople*, at this time, ſeveral perſons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; ſome who diſplayed, in their writings againſt the Latins, a conſiderable knowledge of the art of reaſoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controverſy; and others who compoſed the hiſtory of their own times with accuracy and with elegance. The controverſy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed in a particular manner to excite the literary emulation of the diſputants, rendered them ſtudious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus rouzed and invigorated talents that were ready to periſh in indolence and ſloth.

Of philoſophy.

II. We learn from the accounts of Zonaras, that the ſtudy of philoſophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the ſciences in general, under the emperor Theophilus, and his ſon Michael III. This revival of letters was principally owing [o] to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from Bardas, who had been declared Cæsar, himſelf a weak and illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated Photius, the great patron of ſcience, by whoſe counſel he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men to whom Bardas committed the culture of the ſciences, he placed Leo, ſurnamed the Wise, a man of the moſt profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was conſecrated biſhop of *Theſſalonica*. Photius explained the *Categories* of Aristotle, while Michael Psellus gave a brief expoſition of the other works of that great philoſopher.

The ſtate of learning among the Arabians.

III. The Arabians, who, inſtead of cultivating the arts and ſciences, had thought of nothing hitherto but of extending their territories, were now excited to literary purſuits by Almamunis, otherwiſe called Abu Gaafar

---

[o] *Annalium* tom. ii. lib. xvi. p. 126. tom. x. *Corporis Byzantini*.

Abdallah, whoſe zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whoſe munificence towards men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auſpicious protection of this celebrated Caliph of *Babylon* and *Egypt*, the Arabians made a rapid and aſtoniſhing progreſs in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began to reign about the time of the death of Charlemagne, and died in the year 833. He erected the famous ſchools of *Bagdad*, *Cuſa*, and *Baſora*, and eſtabliſhed ſeminaries of learning in ſeveral other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary liberality, ſet up noble libraries in various places, had tranſlations made of the beſt Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vaſt expence, and employed every method of promoting the cauſe of learning, that became a great and generous prince, whoſe zeal for the ſciences was attended with knowledge [*p*]. It was under the reign of this immortal Caliph, that the Arabians began to take pleaſure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in *Syria* and *Africa*, but alſo in *Spain* and *Italy*; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philoſophers, phyſicians, aſtronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation through ſeveral ſucceeding ages [*q*]. And in this certainly they do not boaſt without reaſon, though we are not to conſider, as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen hiſtory tell us of theſe illuſtrious philoſophers.

After this period the European Chriſtians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for the improvement they made in the various ſciences. For the mathematics, aſtronomy, phyſic, and philoſophy, that were taught in *Europe* from the tenth century, were, for the moſt part, drawn from the Arabian ſchools, that were eſtabliſhed in *Spain* and *Italy*, or, from the writings of the Arabian ſages. And from hence the Saracens may, in one reſpect, be juſtly conſidered as the reſtorers of learning in *Europe*.

The State of letters under Charlemagne, and his ſucceſſors.

IV. In that part of *Europe*, that was ſubject to the dominion of the Franks, Charlemagne laboured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of uſeful learning, and animated his ſubjects to the culture of the ſciences in all their various branches. So that, had his ſucceſſors been diſpoſed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbariſm and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain ſpirit of emulation, which animated his immediate ſucceſſors to imitate, in ſome meaſure, his zeal for the proſperity of the republic of letters. Lewis the Meek both formed and executed ſeveral deſigns that were extremely conducive to the progreſs of the arts and ſciences [*r*]; and his zeal, in this reſpect, was ſurpaſſed by the ardour with which his ſon Charles the Bald exerted himſelf in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the moſt alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the ſciences drew the *literati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their converſation, multiplied and embelliſhed the ſeminaries of learning, and protected, in a more eſpecial manner, the aulic ſchool, of which mention has been formerly made, and which was firſt erected in the ſeventh century, in order to the education of the royal family, and the firſt nobility [ſ]. His brother LOTHAIRE endeavoured to revive in *Italy* the drooping ſciences, and to reſtore them from that ſtate of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall. For this purpoſe he erected ſchools in the eight principal cities of *Italy*, A. D. 823 [*t*], but with little ſucceſs, ſince it appears that that country was entirely deſtitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century [*u*].

[*p*] Abulpharaius, *Hiſtoria Dynaſtiar.* p. 246. Georg. Elmacin. *Hiſtor. Saracen* lib. ii. p. 139. Barthol. Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* Article *Mamun.* p. 545.

[*q*] See the treatiſe of Leo Africanus, *De Medicis et Philoſophis Arabibus*, publiſhed a ſecond time by Fabricius, in the twelfth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 259.

[*r*] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 583.

In *England* learning had a better fate under the auſpicious protection of king ALFRED, who has acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progreſs he made in all kinds of elegant and uſeful knowledge [*w*], but alſo by the care he took to multiply men of letters and genius in his dominions, and to reſtore to the ſciences, ſacred and profane, the credit and luſtre they ſo eminently deſerve [*x*].

Impediments to the progreſs of learning.

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all theſe projects for the advancement of learning much leſs conſiderable than might have otherwiſe been expected. The protectors and patrons of the learned, were themſelves learned; their authority was reſpectable, and their munificence was boundleſs; and yet the progreſs of ſcience towards perfection was but ſlow, becauſe the interruptions ariſing from the troubled ſtate of *Europe* were frequent. The diſcords that aroſe between LEWIS the MEEK and his ſons, which were ſucceeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded conſiderably the progreſs of letters in the empire; and the incurſions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted *Europe* during the whole courſe of this century, were ſo fatal to the culture of the arts and ſciences, that in moſt

---

[ſ] HERMAN. CONRINGII *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 320. CÆS. EG. DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 178. LAUNOIUS, *De Scholis Caroli M.* cap. xi, xii. p. 47. *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 483.

[*t*] See the edict for that purpoſe among the *Capitularia* in MURATORI *Rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part. II. p. 151.

[*u*] See MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 829.

[*w*] See ANT. WOOD, *Hiſt. et Antiquit. Academ. Oxonienſ.* lib. i. p. 13. BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 211. *General Dictionary*, at the article ALFRED. [This prince, among other pious and learned labours, tranſlated the *Paſtoral of* GREGORY I, BOETIUS *De Conſolatione*, and BEDE's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.]

[(*x*) This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality ſuch of his own ſubjects as made any progreſs in the liberal arts and ſciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of diſtinguiſhed talents, whom he fixed in a ſeminary at *Oxford*, and, of conſequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble univerſity. JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, who had been in the ſervice of CHARLES the BALD, and GRIMBALD, a monk of *St. Bertin* in *France*, were the moſt famous of thoſe learned men who came from abroad; ASSERIUS, WEREFRID, PLEGMUND, DUNWUF, WULFSIG, and the abbot of *St. Neot's*, deſerve the firſt rank among the Engliſh *literati*, who adorned the age of ALFRED. See COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, vol. i. book III. p. 165, 166, &c. RAPIN THOYRAS, in the reign of this illuſtrious monarch.]

of the European provinces, and even in *France*, there remained but a ſmall number who truly deſerved the title of learned men [y]. The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy, were confined to the monaſteries, and to the epiſcopal ſchools; but the zeal of the monkiſh and prieſtly orders for the improvement of the mind, and the culture of the ſciences, diminiſhed in proportion as their revenues increaſed, ſo that their indolence and ignorance grew with their poſſeſſions.

Examples of learned men who flouriſhed in this century.

VI. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that ſeveral examples of learned men, whoſe zeal for the ſciences was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, ſhone forth with a diſtinguiſhed luſtre through the darkneſs of this barbarous age. Among theſe, the firſt rank is due to RABANUS MAURUS, whoſe fame was great through all *Germany* and *France*, and to whom the youth reſorted, in prodigious numbers from all parts, to receive his inſtructions in the liberal arts and ſciences. The writers of hiſtory, whoſe works have deſervedly preſerved their names from oblivion, are EGINHARD, FRECULPH, THEGAN, HAYMO, ANASTASIUS, ADO, and others of leſs note. FLORUS, WALAFRIDUS STRABO, BERTHARIUS, and RABANUS, excelled in poetry. SMARAGDUS and BERTHARIUS were eminent for their ſkill in grammar and languages, as was alſo the celebrated RABANUS already mentioned, who acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned and ſubtile treatiſe concerning the cauſes and the riſe of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudition was cultivated with conſiderable ſucceſs by WILLIAM, SERVATUS LUPUS, SCOTUS, and others. EGINHARD, AGOBARD, HINCMAR, and SERVATUS LUPUS, were much celebrated for the eloquence, which appeared both in their diſcourſes and in their writings [z].

Johannes Scotus Erigena.

VII. The philoſophy and logic that were taught in the European ſchools during this century, ſcarcely deſerved ſuch honourable titles, and were little better than an empty jargon. There were, however, to be found in various places, particularly among the Iriſh, men of acute parts, and extenſive knowledge, who were perfectly well entitled to the appellation of philoſophers. The chief of theſe was JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA [a], a native of *Ireland*, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, who delighted ſo much in his converſation as to honour him with a place at his table. SCOTUS was endowed with an excellent and truly ſuperior genius, and was conſiderably verſed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his diſciples the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, for which he was ſingularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but as his genius was too bold and aſpiring to confine itſelf to the authority and deciſions of the Stagirite, he puſhed his philoſophical reſearches yet farther, dared to think for himſelf, and ventured to purſue truth without any other guide than his own reaſon. We have yet extant of his compoſition, *Five Books concerning the diviſion of nature*, an intricate and ſubtile production, in which the cauſes and principles of all things are inveſtigated with a conſiderable degree of ſagacity, and in which alſo the precepts of Chriſtianity are allegorically explained, yet in ſuch a manner as to ſhew that their ultimate end is the union of the ſoul with the ſupreme Being. He was the firſt, who blended the *ſcholaſtic theology* with the *myſtic*, and formed them into one ſyſtem. It has alſo been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of thoſe who conſider the union of *God* and *nature*, as ſimilar to the union that ſubſiſts between the ſoul and the body, a notion much the ſame with that of many ancient philoſophers, who looked upon the deity as the ſoul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alledged, and not without reaſon, that what SCOTUS ſaid upon this ſubject amounted to no more than what the *Realiſts*[*b*], as they are called, maintained afterwards, though it muſt be allowed that he has expreſſed himſelf in a very perplexed and obſcure manner [*c*]. This celebrated philoſopher formed no particular ſect, at leaſt, as far as is come to our knowledge; and this will be conſidered, by thoſe who are acquainted with the ſpirit of the times he lived in, as a proof that his immenſe learning was accompanied with meekneſs and modeſty.

---

[y] SERVATI LUPI *Epiſtolæ* xxxiv. p. 69. CONRINGII *Antiq. Acad.* p. 322. *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251.

[z] Such as are deſirous of a more circumſtantial account of theſe writers, and of their various productions, may conſult the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251 to 271. Or the more ample account given of them by the celebrated LE BEUF, in his *Etat des Sciences en France depuis Charlemagne juſqu' au Roi Robert*, which is publiſhed in his *Recueil de divers ecrits pour ſervir d'Eclairciſſemens à l'Hiſtoire de France*, tom. ii. p. 1. *Paris* 1738, en 8vo.

[(a) ERIGENA ſignifies properly a native of *Ireland*, as *Erin*, or *Irin*, was the ancient name of that kingdom.]

About this time lived a certain perſon named MACARIUS, a native of *Ireland*, who propagated in *France* that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and profeſſed by AVERROES, that one individual intelligence, one ſoul performed the ſpiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by RATRAM, a famous monk of *Corbey*[*d*]. Before theſe writers flouriſhed DUNGAL, a native of *Ireland* alſo, who left his country, and retired into a French monaſtery, where he lived during the reigns of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, and taught philoſophy and aſtronomy with the greateſt reputation [*e*]. HERIC, a monk of *Auxerre*, made

---

[(*b*) The *Realiſts*, who followed the doctrine of ARISTOTLE with reſpect to *univerſal ideas*, were ſo called in oppoſition to the *Nominaliſts*, who embraced the hypotheſis of ZENO and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate ſubject. ARISTOTLE held, againſt PLATO, that previous to, and independent on, matter, there were no univerſal *ideas* or *eſſences*, and that the ideas or exemplars which the latter ſuppoſed to have exiſted in the divine mind, and to have been the *models* of all created things, had been eternally impreſſed upon matter, and were coëval with, and inherent in, their objects. ZENO and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Ariſtotelian ſyſtems, maintained, that theſe pretended *univerſals* had neither *form* nor *eſſence*, and were no more than mere terms and *nominal* repreſentations of their particular objects. The doctrine of ARISTOTLE prevailed until the eleventh century, when ROSCELINUS embraced the Stoical ſyſtem, and founded the ſect of the *Nominaliſts*, whoſe ſentiments were propagated with great ſucceſs by the famous ABELARD. Theſe two ſects differed conſiderably among themſelves, and explained, or rather obſcured, their reſpective tenets in a variety of ways]

[*c*] The work here alluded to was publiſhed at *Oxford*, by Mr. THOMAS GALE, in 1681. The learned HEUMAN has made ſeveral extracts from it, and given alſo an ample and learned account of SCOTUS, in his *Acts of the Philoſophers*, written in *German*, tom. iii. p. 858.

[*d*] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. part. II. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, § 156. p. 53.

[*e*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 493.

likewiſe an eminent figure among the learned of this age; he was a man of uncommon ſagacity, was endowed with a great and aſpiring genius, and is ſaid, in many things, to have anticipated the famous DESCARTES in the manner of inveſtigating truth [*f*].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church and its form of government during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. THE impiety and licentiouſneſs of the greateſt part of the clergy aroſe, at this time, to an enormous height, and ſtand, upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the moſt candid and impartial writers of this century [*g*]. In the eaſt tumult, diſcord, conſpiracies, and treaſons, reigned uncontrouled, and all things were carried by violence and force. Theſe abuſes appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*. The favour of the court was become the only ſtep to that high and important office; and as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent poſt depended upon ſuch an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more uſual, than to ſee a prelate pulled down from his epiſcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the weſtern provinces, the biſhops were become voluptuous and effeminate to a very high degree. They paſſed their lives amidſt the ſplendor of courts, and the pleaſures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taſte, extinguiſhed their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the ſolemn duties of their function [*h*]; while the inferior clergy were ſunk in licentiouſneſs, minded nothing but ſenſual gratifications, and infected, with the moſt heinous vices, the flock, whom it was the very buſineſs of their miniſtry to preſerve, or to deliver, from the contagion of iniquity. Beſides, the ignorance of the ſacred order was, in many places, ſo deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and ſtill fewer were capable of expreſſing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perſpicuity. Hence it happened, that when letters were to be penned, or any matter of conſequence was to be committed to writing, they had commonly recourſe to ſome one perſon, who was ſuppoſed to be endowed with ſuperior abilities, as appears in the caſe of SERVATUS LUPUS [*i*].

The cauſes of this corruption.

II. Many circumſtances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiouſneſs, ſo ſhameful in an order of men, who were ſet apart to exhibit examples of piety to the reſt of the world. Among theſe we may reckon as the chief ſources of the evil under conſideration, the calamities of the times, even the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried between **Lewis the Meek**, and his family, the incurſions and conqueſts of the barbarous nations, the groſs and incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the affluence and riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious ſeminaries from all quarters. Many other cauſes alſo contributed to diſhonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt miniſtry. A nobleman, who through want of talents, activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views towards the church, aimed at a diſtinguiſhed place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in conſequence, a contagious example of ſtupidity and vice to the inferior clergy [*k*]. The patrons of churches, in whom reſided the right of election, unwilling to ſubmit their diſorderly conduct to the keen cenſure of zealous and upright paſtors, induſtriouſly looked for the moſt abject, ignorant, and worthleſs eccleſiaſtics, to whom they committed the cure of ſouls [*l*]. But one of the circumſtances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at leaſt, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their ſtation, was the obligation they were under of performing certain ſervices to their ſovereigns, in conſequence of the poſſeſſions they derived from the royal bounty. The biſhops and heads of monaſteries held many lands and caſtles by a feudal tenure, and being thereby bound to furniſh their princes with a certain number of ſoldiers in time of war, were obliged alſo to take the field themſelves at the head of theſe troops [*m*], and thus to act in a ſphere that was utterly inconſiſtent with the nature and duties of their ſacred character. Beſides all this, it often happened, that rapacious princes, in order to ſatisfy the craving wants of their ſoldiers and domeſtics, boldly invaded the poſſeſſions of the church, which they diſtributed among their armies; in conſequence of which the prieſts and monks, in order to avoid periſhing through hunger, abandoned themſelves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all ſorts of crimes, which they looked upon as the only means, they had left, of procuring themſelves a ſubſiſtence [*n*].

[*f*] LE BEUF, *Memoires pour l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii p. 481. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iv. *M. Junii ad d.* xxiv. p. 829. *& ad d.* xxxi. *Jul.* p. 249. For this philoſopher has obtained a place among the ſaintly order.

[*g*] See AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotii*, § 13. p. 137. tom. i. Opp. ed. *Baluzii*.

[*h*] The reader will be convinced of this by conſulting AGOBARD *paſſim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for reſtraining the diſorders of the clergy. See alſo SERVATUS LUPUS *Epiſt.* xxxv. p. 73. 281. and STEPH. BALUZ. in *Adnot.* p. 378.

[*i*] See the works of SERVATUS LUPUS *Epiſt.* xcviii. xcix. p. 126. 142. 148. as alſo his *Life.* See alſo RODOLPHI *Bituricenſis Capitula ad clerum ſuum*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom. vi. p. 139. 148.

The Roman pontifs.

III. The Roman pontifs were raiſed to that high dignity by the ſuffrages of the ſacerdotal order, accompanied with the voice of the people; but after their election, the approbation of the emperor was neceſſary in order to their conſecration [*o*]. There is indeed, yet extant, an edict, ſuppoſed to have been publiſhed, in the year 817, by LEWIS the MEEK, in which he aboliſhes this imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the power of electing their pontif, but alſo the privilege of inſtalling and conſecrating him when elected, without waiting for the conſent of the emperor [*p*]. But this grant will deceive none, who inquire into this matter with any degree of attention and diligence, ſince ſeveral learned men have proved it ſpurious by the moſt irreſiſtible arguments [*q*]. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that after the time of CHARLES the BALD, a new ſcene of things aroſe; and the important change abovementioned was really introduced. That prince having obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the biſhop of *Rome*, returned this eminent ſervice by delivering the ſucceeding pontifs from the obligation of waiting for the conſent of the emperors, in order to their being inſtalled in their office. And thus we find, that from the time of EUGENIUS III, who was raiſed to the pontificate A. D. 884, the election of the biſhops of *Rome* was carried on without the leaſt regard to law, order, or even decency, and was generally attended with civil tumults and diſſenſions, until the reign of OTHO the GREAT, who put a ſtop to theſe diſorderly proceedings.

[*k*] Hincmarus, *Oper. Poſterior. contra Godeſchalcum*, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. Opp. p. 318. Servatus Lupus *Epiſt.* lxxix p. 120.

[*l*] Agobardus, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotum*, cap. xi. p. 341. tom. i. Opp.

[*m*] Steph. Baluzii *Appendix Actor. ad Servatum*, p. 508. Muratori *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 446. Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 587. Fresne *ad Joinvillii Hiſt. Ludovici S.* p. 75, 76.

[*n*] Agobardus, *De diſpenſ. rerum Eccleſiaſt.* § 4. p. 270. tom. i. Opp. Flodoardus, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Rhemenſis*, lib. iii. cap. ix. Servatus Lupus *Epiſt.* xlv. p. 87. 437, &c. Muratori, tom. vi. *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, p. 302. Lud. Thomasin, *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ vet. et nova circa beneficia*, part. II. lib. iii. cap. xi. Theſe corrupt meaſures prevailed alſo among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be ſeen in the *Oriens Chriſtianus* of Lequien, tom. i p. 142.

The frauds practiſed by the Roman pontifs to increaſe their power.

IV. Among the prelates that were raiſed to the pontificate, in this century, there were very few, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were at all careful about acquiring thoſe particular qualities that are eſſential to the character of a Chriſtian biſhop. On the contrary, the greateſt part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have tranſmitted their names with infamy to our times; and they all, in general, ſeem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and univerſal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event, which is ſaid to have interrupted the much vaunted ſucceſſion of regular biſhops, in the ſee of *Rome*, from the firſt foundation of that church to the preſent times. Between the pontificate of LEO IV, who died in the year 855, and that of BENEDICT III, a certain woman, who had the art to diſguiſe her ſect for a conſiderable time, is ſaid, by her learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontif about two years. This extraordinary perſon is yet known by the title of POPE JOAN. During the five ſucceeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vaſt number of writers bore teſtimony to its truth; nor before the reformation, undertaken by LUTHER, was it conſidered by any, either as incredible in itſelf, or as ignominious to the church [*r*]. But in the laſt century, the elevation, and, indeed, the exiſtence of this female pontif, became the ſubject of a keen and learned controverſy; and ſeveral men of diſtinguiſhed abilities both among the Roman catholics and proteſtants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to deſtroy the credit of this ſtory, by invalidating, on the one hand, the weight of the teſtimonies on which it is founded, and by ſhewing on the other, that it was inconſiſtent with the moſt accurate chronological computations [*s*]. Between the contending parties, ſome of the wiſeſt and moſt learned writers have judiciouſly ſteered a middle courſe: they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumſtances have been interwoven with this ſtory, but they deny that it is entirely deſtitute of all foundation, or, that the controverſy is yet ended, in a ſatisfactory manner, in favour of thoſe who diſpute its truth. And, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that ſome unuſual event muſt have happened at *Rome*, from which this ſtory derived its origin; becauſe it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event ſhould be univerſally believed and related in the ſame manner by a multitude of hiſtorians, during five centuries immediately ſucceeding its ſuppoſed date, if that event was abſolutely deſtitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave riſe to this ſtory, is yet to be diſcovered, and is likely to remain ſo [*t*].

[*o*] See DE BÜNAU, *Hiſtor. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 28. 32.

[*p*] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iv. p. 1236. LE COINTE, *Annales Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. vii. *ad A.* 817. § 6. BALUZII *Capitular. Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 591.

[*q*] MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſt.* p. 54. and *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 29, 30. in which that learned man conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. BÜNAU, *Hiſt. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 34. The partiſans, however, of the papal authority, ſuch as FONTANINI and others, plead ſtrenuouſly, though ineffectually for the authenticity of the edict in queſtion.

Their zealous attachment to the kings of *France*, by whom they are favoured.

V. The enormous vices, that muſt have covered ſo many pontifs with infamy in the judgment of the wiſe, formed not the leaſt obſtacle to their ambition in theſe miſerable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and ſtate. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their poſſeſſions augmented in proportion to the progreſs of their authority, nor that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of *France*. The donations, which LEWIS the MEEK is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally deſtitute of truth and probability [u]; and nothing is more groundleſs than the accounts of thoſe writers who affirm, that Charles the Bald diveſted himſelf, in the year 875, of his right to the city of *Rome*, and its territory, in favour of the pontifs, whom he, at the ſame time, enriched with a variety of noble and coſtly preſents, in return for the good ſervices of John VIII, by whoſe ſuccours he was raiſed to the empire. But be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the biſhops of *Rome* increaſed greatly from the time of Lewis the Meek, but more eſpecially from the acceſſion of Charles the Bald, to the imperial throne, as all the hiſtorical records of that period abundantly teſtify [w].

[*r*] The arguments of thoſe who maintain the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one ſtriking point of view with great learning and induſtry by FRED. SPANHEIM, in his *Exercitatio de Papa Femina*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 577. This Diſſertation was tranſlated into French by the celebrated LENFANT, who digeſted it into a better method, and enriched it with ſeveral additions.

[*s*] The arguments of thoſe who reject the ſtory of *Pope Joan* as a fable, have been collected by DAVID BLONDEL, and after him with ſtill more art and erudition by BAYLE, in the third volume of his *Dictionary*, at the article PAPESSE. Add to this JO. GEORG. ECCARD. *Hiſtor. Franciæ Oriental.* tom. ii. lib. xxx. § 119. p. 436. which author has adopted and appropriated the ſentiments of the great LEIBNITZ, upon the matter in queſtion. See alſo LEQUIEN's *Oriens Chriſtian.* tom. iii. p. 777. and HEUMAN's *Sylloge Diſſert. Sacrar.* tom. i. part. II. p. 352. The very learned JO. CHRISTOPH. WAGENSELIUS has given a juſt and accurate view of the arguments on both ſides, which may be ſeen in the *Amoenitates Litterariæ* of SCHELHORNIUS, part. i. p. 146. and the ſame has been done by BASNAGE, in his *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 408. A liſt of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate queſtion, may be ſeen in CASP. SAGITTARIUS's *Introd. in Hiſt. Eccleſ.* tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676. and in the *Biblioth. Bremenſ.* tom. viii part. V. p. 935.

[*t*] Such is the opinion of PAUL SARPI, in his *Lettere Italiane*, Lett. lxxxii. p. 452; of LENFANT *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. x. p. 27; of THEOD. HASÆUS *Biblioth. Bremenſ.* tom. viii. part. V. p. 935; and of the celebrated PFAFF *Inſtit. Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* p. 402; to whom we might

They gain by the troubles that ariſe in the empire.

VI. After the death of Lewis II, a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the poſterity of Charlemagne, among which there were ſeveral competitors for the empire. This furniſhed the Italian princes, and the Roman pontif John VIII, with a favourable opportunity of aſſuming to themſelves the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all part in this election the nations who had formerly the right of ſuffrage; and if the opportunity was favorable, it was ſeized with avidity, and improved with the utmoſt dexterity and zeal. Their favour and intereſt was earneſtly ſollicited by Charles the Bald, whoſe entreaties were rendered effectual by rich preſents, prodigious ſums of money, and moſt pompous promiſes, in conſequence of which he was proclaimed, A. D. 876, by the pontif John VIII, and by the Italian princes aſſembled at *Pavia*, king of *Italy*, and emperor of the Romans. Carloman and Charles the Gross, who ſucceeded him in the kingdom of *Italy*, and in the Roman empire, were alſo elected by the Roman pontif, and the Italian princes. After the reigns of theſe princes the empire was torn in pieces; the moſt deplorable tumults and commotions aroſe in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, which were governed, or rather ſubdued and uſurped, by various chiefs, and, in this confuſed ſcene of things, the higheſt bidder was, by the ſuccour of the greedy pontifs, generally raiſed to the government of *Italy*, and to the imperial throne [x].

The emperors diveſted of their eccleſiaſtical authority, and the power of the councils and of the biſhops diminiſhed.

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontifs, in civil affairs, aroſe in a ſhort time to an enormous height through the favour and protection of the princes, in whoſe cauſe they had employed the influence, which ſuperſtition had given them over the minds of the people. The increaſe of their authority, in religious matters, was not leſs rapid, nor leſs conſiderable, and it aroſe from the ſame cauſes. The wiſeſt and moſt impartial among the Roman Catholic writers not only acknowledge, but are even at pains to demonſtrate,

---

add Wernsdorff, Boecler, Holberg, and many others, were this enumeration neceſſary. Without aſſuming the character of a judge in this intricate controverſy, concerning which ſo many falſe deciſions have been pronounced, I ſhall only take the liberty to obſerve that the matter in debate is as yet dubious, and has not on either ſide been repreſented in ſuch a light as to bring conviction.

[u] See above, § 3.

[w] Bunau, *Hiſtor. Imperii Rom. German.* tom. iii. p. 482. Jo. George Eccard, *Hiſtor. Franciæ Orient.* tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

[x] This matter is amply illuſtrated by Sigonius, in his famous book *De Regno Italiæ*, and by the other writers of German and Italian hiſtory.

that from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, the ancient rules of eccleſiaſtical government were gradually changed in *Europe* by the counſels and inſtigation of the court of *Rome*, and new laws ſubſtituted in their place. The European princes ſuffered themſelves to be diveſted of the ſupreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from CHARLEMAGNE; the power of the biſhops was greatly diminiſhed, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontifs, elated with their overgrown proſperity, and become arrogant, beyond meaſure, by the daily acceſſions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon perſuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to perſuade many, that the biſhop of *Rome* was conſtituted and appointed by JESUS CHRIST, ſupreme legiſlator and judge of the church univerſal; and that, therefore, the biſhops derived all their authority from the Roman pontif, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permiſſion and conſent [*y*]. This opinion, which was inculcated by the pontifs with the utmoſt zeal and ardour, was oppoſed by ſuch as were acquainted with the ancient eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was oppoſed in vain.

Forged memorials and acts procured by the pontifs, to eſtabliſh their ſupremacy.

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new eccleſiaſtical code, ſo different from the ancient rules of church government, and to ſupport the haughty pretenſions of the pontifs to ſupremacy and independence, it was neceſſary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to ſtop the mouths of ſuch as were diſpoſed to ſet bounds to their uſurpations. The biſhops of *Rome* were aware of this, and as thoſe means were looked upon as the moſt lawful that tended beſt to the accompliſhment of their purpoſes, they employed ſome of their moſt ingenious and zealous partiſans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epiſtles, and ſuch like records, by which it might appear, that, in the firſt ages of the church, the Roman pontifs were cloathed with the ſame ſpiritual majeſty, and ſupreme authority which they now aſſumed [*z*].

Decretals.

Among theſe fictitious ſupports of the papal dignity, the famous *decretal epiſtles*, as they are called, ſaid to have been written by the pontifs of the primitive times, deſerve chiefly to be ſtigmatized. They were the production of an obſcure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them the name of ISIDORE, biſhop of *Seville* [a], to make the world believe they had been collected by that illuſtrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century [b], but they were now entirely drawn from their obſcurity, and produced, with an air of oſtentation and triumph, to demonſtrate the ſupremacy of the Roman pontifs [c]. The deciſions of a certain Roman council, which is ſaid to have been held during the pontificate of SILVESTER, were likewiſe alledged in behalf of the ſame cauſe; but this council had never been ſo much as heard of before the preſent century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the ſame ſource with the *decretals*, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the Roman pontifs, and exalt them above all human authority and juriſdiction [d].

[*y*] See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who ſigns himſelf D. B. and whoſe book is intitled, *Hiſtoire du Droit Eccleſiaſtique public François*, publiſhed at firſt at *London*, in two volume 8vo, in the year 1737, and lately republiſhed in a larger and more ſplendid edition. The author of this performance ſhews, in a judicious and conciſe manner, the various ſteps by which the papal authority aroſe to ſuch a monſtrous height. His account of the ninth century may be ſeen in the firſt volume of his work, at the 160th page.

[*z*] There is juſt reaſon to imagine, that theſe *Decretals* and various other acts, ſuch as the grants of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, were forged with the knowledge and conſent of the Roman pontifs; ſince it is utterly incredible, that theſe pontifs ſhould, for many ages, have conſtantly appealed, in ſupport of their pretended rights and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private perſons, and ſhould, with ſuch weak arms, have ſtood out againſt kings, princes, councils, and biſhops, who were unwilling to receive their yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been uſeleſs here, and public deeds were neceſſary to accompliſh the views of papal ambition. Such forgeries were, in this century, eſteemed lawful, on account of their ſuppoſed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the proſperity of the church: and, therefore, it is not ſurprizing, that the *good* pontifs ſhould feel no remorſe in impoſing upon the world frauds and forgeries, that were deſigned to enrich the patrimony of St. PETER, and to aggrandize his ſucceſſors in the apoſtolic ſee.

The ſucceſs of theſe frauds.

IX. There were not, however, wanting among the Latin biſhops men of prudence and ſagacity, who ſaw through theſe impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French biſhops diſtinguiſhed themſelves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they oppoſed theſe ſpurious *decretals*, and other like fictitious monuments and records, and proteſted againſt their being received among the laws of the church. But the obſtinacy of the pontifs, and particularly of NICOLAS I, conquered this oppoſition, and reduced it to ſilence. And as the empire, in the periods that ſucceeded this conteſt, fell back into the groſſeſt ignorance and darkneſs, there ſcarcely remained any who were capable of detecting theſe odious impoſtures, or diſpoſed to ſupport the expiring liberty of the church. The hiſtory of the following ages ſhews, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the diſorders and calamities that ſprung from the ambition of the aſpiring pontifs; It repreſents theſe deſpotic lords of the church, labouring by the aid of their impious frauds to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its biſhops, to engroſs its riches and revenues into their own hands, nay, what is ſtill more horrible, it repreſents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to leſſen their power, and to ſet bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimouſly acknowledged by ſuch as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the hiſtory of the times of which we now write, and is ingenuouſly confeſſed by men of learning and probity, that are well affected to the Romiſh church and its ſovereign pontif [e].

---

[a] It is certain, that the forger of the *decretals* was extremely deſirous of perſuading the world, that they were collected by ISIDORE, the celebrated biſhop of *Seville*, who lived in the ſixth century. See FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 561. It was a cuſtom among the biſhops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet *Peccator*, i. e. *Sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, the forger of the *Decretals* has added the word *Peccator* after the name of ISIDORE; but this ſome ignorant tranſcribers have abſurdly changed into the word *Mercator*; and hence it happens, that one ISIDORUS *Mercator* paſſes for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the *decretals*.

[b] See DON CALMET, *Hiſtoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 528. B. JUST. HEN. BÖHMER. *Præf. ad novam Edit. Juris Canon.* tom. i. p. x. xix. *Not.*

[c] Beſide the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes* and other writers, the learned BLONDEL has demonſtrated, in an ample and ſatisfactory manner, the ſpuriouſneſs of the *decretals*, in his *Pſeudo-Iſidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; and in our time the cheat is acknowledged even by the Roman Catholics, at leaſt by ſuch of them as are poſſeſſed of any tolerable degree of judgment and impartiality. See BUDDEUS's *Iſagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 762; as alſo PETR. COUSTANTIUS, his *Prolegom. ad Epiſtolas Pontificum*, tom. i. p. 130; and a *Diſſertation* of FLEURY, prefixed to the ſixteenth volume of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*.

[d] See JO. LAUNOIUS, *De cura Eccleſiæ erga pauperes et miſeros*, cap. i. Obſervat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part. II. Opp.

The monaſtic life in high repute.

X. The monaſtic life was now univerſally in the higheſt eſteem, and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to ſuch as devoted themſelves to the ſacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accuſtomed to regard the monkiſh orders and diſcipline with the greateſt admiration; but it was only ſince the beginning of the laſt century, that this holy paſſion was indulged among the Latins to ſuch an extravagant length. In the preſent age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts forgot their true dignity, even the fulfilling with zeal the duties of their high ſtations, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really nothing elſe but the reſult of a narrow and ſuperſtitious ſpirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treaſures, and ſhut themſelves up in monaſteries with a view of devoting themſelves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, and *Spain*, both in this and the preceding century. And if the allurements of worldly pleaſures and honours had too much power over the minds of many to permit their ſeparating themſelves from human ſociety, during their lives, ſuch endeavoured to make amends for this in their laſt hours; for when they perceived death approaching, they demanded the monaſtic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they might be regarded as of the fraternity, and be of conſequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other ſpiritual ſuccours of their ghoſtly brethren.

Monks and abbots employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes.

But nothing affords ſuch a ſtricking and remarkable proof of the exceſſive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the Monaſtic order, as the treatment they received from ſeveral kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloiſters, and placed them in ſtations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidſt the ſplendor of a court, and at the head of affairs. The tranſition, indeed, was violent from the obſcurity of a convent and the ſtudy of a liturgy, to ſit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political intereſts of nations. But ſuch was the caſe, and pious princes alledged as a reaſon for this ſingular choice, that the government of a ſtate could never be better placed than in the hands of ſuch holy men, who had ſubdued all irregular appetites and paſſions, and were ſo diveſted of the luſt of pleaſure, and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy deſigns, any low, ſordid, or ſelfiſh views. Hence we find in the hiſtory of theſe times frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambaſſadors, envoys, and miniſters of ſtate, and diſplaying their talents with various ſucceſs in theſe high and eminent ſtations.

---

[e] See the abovementioned author's treatiſe, entitled, *Regia Poteſtas in Cauſis Matrimonial.* tom. i. part. II. Opp. p. 764; as alſo PETR. COUSTANTIUS, *Præf. ad Epiſt. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. i. p. 127.

A reformation of the monaſtic order attempted,

XI. The morals, however, of the monks were far from being ſo pure as to juſtify the reaſon alledged above for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were ſenſible of the irregular and licentious lives that many of them led, and uſed their utmoſt efforts to correct their vices, and to reform their manners. LEWIS the MEEK diſtinguiſhed his zeal in the excecution of this virtuous and noble deſign; and to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in reforming the monaſteries firſt in *Aquitaine*, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and in reſtoring, by new and ſalutary laws, the monaſtic diſcipline which was abſolutely neglected and fallen into decay. This worthy eccleſiaſtic preſided in the year 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, where ſeveral wiſe meaſures were taken for removing the diſorders that reigned in the cloiſters; and in conſequence of the unlimited authority, he had received from the emperor, he ſubjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous BENEDICT abbot of *Mount Caſſin*, annulled that variety of rites and cuſtoms that had obtained in the different monaſteries, preſcribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or ſociety, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond [f]. This admirable diſcipline, which acquired to BENEDICT of *Aniane*, the higheſt reputation, and made him be revered as the ſecond father of the weſtern monks, flouriſhed during a certain time; but afterwards declined through various cauſes, until the concluſion of this century, when under the calamities that oppreſſed both the church and the empire, it almoſt entirely diſappeared.

Canons and canoneſſes.

XII. The ſame emperor, who had appeared with ſuch zeal both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave alſo diſtinguiſhed marks of his favour to the order of *canons*, which CHRODEGANGUS had introduced in ſeveral places during the laſt century. He diſtributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and inſtituted alſo an order of *canoneſſes*, which was the firſt female convent known in the Chriſtian world [g]. For each of theſe orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up A. D. 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, which he ſubſtituted in the place of that which had been appointed by CHRODEGANGUS, and this new rule was obſerved in the moſt of the monaſteries and convents of the canons and canoneſſes in the weſt until the XII century, notwithſtanding that it was diſapproved of by the court of *Rome* [h]. The author of the rule that was appointed for the *canons* was, undoubtedly, AMALARIUS, a preſbyter of *Metz*; but it is not ſo certain whether that which was drawn up for the *canoneſſes* was compoſed by the ſame hand [*i*]. Be that as it may, the *canonical* order grew into high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for them through all the weſtern provinces, and were richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Chriſtians. But this inſtitution degenerated in a ſhort time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceaſed to anſwer the laudable intention and deſign of its worthy founders [*k*].

---

[f] JO. MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iv. part. I. *Præf.* p. xxvii. and *Præf. ad Sæc.* v. p. xxv. EJUSDEM, *Annales Ordin. S. Benedict.* tom. ii p. 430. CALMET, *Hiſt. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of BENEDICT of *Aniane*, and his illuſtrious virtues, ſee the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Febr.* p. 606; and the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv p. 447.

[g] See MABILLON, *Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti*, tom ii. p. 428.

[h] This rule was condemned in a council held at *Rome*, A. D. 1059, under the pontif NICHOLAS II. The pretexts uſed by the pontif and the aſſembled prelates, to juſtify their diſappro-

The principal Greek writers.

XIII. Of the theological writers that flouriſhed among the Greeks, the following are the moſt remarkable:

PHOTIUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, a man of moſt profound and univerſal erudition, whoſe *Bibliotheca* [*l*], *Epiſtles*, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts.

NICEPHORUS, alſo patriarch of the abovementioned city, who, among other productions, publiſhed a warm defence of the worſhip of images againſt the enemies of that idolatrous ſervice [*m*].

THEODORUS STUDITES, who acquired a name, chiefly by his warm oppoſition to the *Iconoclaſts*, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image-worſhip [*n*].

The ſame cauſe has principally contributed to tranſmit to after ages the names of THEODORUS GRAPTUS, METHODIUS, who obtained the title of *Confeſſor* for his adherence to image-worſhip in the very face of perſecution, THEODORUS ABUCARA [*o*], PETRUS SICULUS, NICETAS DAVID, and others, who would probably have been long ſince buried in oblivion, had not the various conteſts between the Greek and Latin churches, and the diviſions of the former among themſelves upon the queſtion concerning images, excited the vehemence of theſe inconſiderable writers, and furniſhed them with an occaſion of making ſome noiſe in the world.

---

bation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the poſſeſſions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reaſon was, that this order had been inſtituted by an emperor without either the conſent, or knowledge, of the Roman pontif. For an account of the rule and diſcipline of theſe *canons*, ſee FLEURY's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. *Bruſſels* edition in 12mo.

[*i*] LUD. THOMASSIN. *Diſciplin. Eccleſ. Vet. et Novæ*, part I. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 185. 540. No accounts of the *Canons* are leſs worthy of credit, than thoſe that are given by writers, who have been themſelves members of that order, ſuch as RAYMOND CHAPPONEL's *Hiſtoire des Chanoines*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 8vo in the year 1699; for theſe writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their inſtitution, and an ambitious deſire of enhancing its merit and rendering it reſpectable, derive the origin of *canonical order* from CHRIST and his apoſtles, or trace it up, at leaſt, to the firſt ages of the Chriſtian church.

[*k*] CALMET, *Hiſt. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 591. *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 536.

[*l*] See CAMUSAT, *Hiſtoire des Journaux*, tom. i. p. 87.

[*m*] *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Martii ad d.* xiii. p. 293. OUDINUS, *Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 2.

[(*n*) THEODORE STUDITES was one of the moſt voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning to after ages, though the controverſy concerning images had never exiſted. There are of his writings, yet extant, 265 letters, ſeveral treatiſes againſt the Iconoclaſts, 124 epigrams in Iambics, and a large manuſcript, which contains a courſe of catechetical inſtruction concerning the duties of the monaſtic life.]

[*o*] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i at the article ABUCARA.

Moses Barcepha, a Syrian biſhop, ſurpaſſed by far all whom we have now been mentioning, and deſerved the ſhining reputation, which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works diſcover ſeveral marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing [*p*].

Latin writers.

XIV. Rabanus Maurus, archbiſhop of *Mentz*, is deſervedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this diſtinguiſhed rank, and render improper all compariſon between him and his cotemporaries. He may be called the great light of *Germany* and *France*, ſince it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he poſſeſſed, that theſe nations derived principally their religious inſtruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned [*q*], and were held in ſuch veneration, that, during four centuries, the moſt eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in religious matters, and adopted almoſt univerſally the ſentiments they contained. After this illuſtrious prelate, the writers that are moſt worthy of mention are,

Agobard, archbiſhop of *Lyons*, a man of wiſdom and prudence, and far from being deſtitute of literary merit; but whoſe reputation has deſervedly ſuffered by his juſtifying and even fomenting the rebellion of Lothaire and Pepin againſt Lewis the Meek, their father and their ſovereign [*r*].

Hilduin, abbot of *St. Dennis*, who acquired no ſmall reputation by a work entitled, *Areopagitica* [*s*].

Eginhard, abbot of *Selingeſtat*, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perſpicuity and elegance of his ſtyle, and a variety of other literary accompliſhments [*t*].

Claudius, biſhop of *Turin*, whoſe *Expoſition* of ſeveral books of ſcripture [*u*], as alſo his *Chronology* gained him an eminent and laſting reputation [*w*].

Freculf, biſhop of *Lyſieux*, whoſe *Chronicle*, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

[*p*] Jos. Sim. Assemani *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 127.

[*q*] See, for a particular account of the life and writings of Rabanus Maurus, the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 151; as alſo the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Febr.* p. 500.

[*r*] See Colonia, *Hiſt. Litter. de la ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 93. *General Dictionary*, at the article Agobard. *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 567. [Agobard oppoſed with great zeal both the worſhip and the uſe of images, in his famous book *De picturis et imaginibus*, a work which has greatly embaraſſed the doctors of the Romiſh church.]

[*s*] *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 607.

[*t*] *Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 550. See alſo the *Life of Charlemagne*, of which the beſt of fourteen editions is that publiſhed by Schminkius, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1711.

[(*u*) This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy ſcriptures, compoſed III books of commentaries upon *Geneſis*, IV upon *Exodus*, and ſeveral upon *Leviticus*. He wrote alſo a commentary upon the *Goſpel of St. Matthew*, in which there are many excellent things, and an expoſition of all the *Epiſtles of St. Paul*. His commentary on the *Epiſtle to the Galatians* is printed, but all the reſt are in manuſcript.]

[*w*] See Simon, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſ. de M.* Du Pin, tom. i. p. 284.

SERVATUS LUPUS, of whoſe compoſition we have ſeveral epiſtles and treatiſes; and who, though a copious and ſubtile writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition [*x*].

DREPANIUS FLORUS, who left behind him ſeveral *Poems*, *An expoſition of certain books of ſcripture*, and other performances leſs worthy of attention [*y*].

CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, the author of *A commentary upon St. Matthew's Goſpel* [*z*].

GODESCHALC, a monk of *Orbais*, who rendered his name immortal by the controverſy which he ſet on foot concerning *Predeſtination and Free Grace*.

PASCHASIUS RADBERT [*a*], a name famous in the conteſts concerning *The real preſence of Chriſt's body in the Euchariſt*; and who, to paſs in ſilence his other writings, compoſed a book upon this very ſubject, which furniſhed abundant matter of diſpute throughout this century.

BERTRAM, or RATRAMN, a monk of *Corby*, who deſerves the firſt rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of RADBERT; and whoſe book concerning *The ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper*, which was compoſed by the order of CHARLES the BALD, gave alſo occaſion to many conteſts among learned divines [*b*].

HAYMO, biſhop of *Halberſtadt*, the laborious author of ſeveral treatiſes upon various ſubjects, and who is more to be eſteemed for his induſtry and diligence, than for his genius and learning [*c*].

WALAFRIDUS STRABO, who acquired no mean reputation by his *Poems*, his *Lives of the ſaints*, and his *Explications* of many of the more difficult paſſages of ſcripture [*d*].

HINCMAR, archbiſhop of *Rheims*, a man of an imperious and turbulent ſpirit; but who deſerves, notwithſtanding, a diſtinguiſhed place among the Latin writers of this century, ſince his works diſcover an aſpiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the purſuit of truth, and tend, moreover, in a ſingular manner, to throw light both upon the civil and eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of the age in which he lived [*e*].

JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, an eminent philoſopher, and a learned divine, whoſe erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of ſagacity and genius, and whoſe various performances, as well as his tranſlations from the Greek, gained him a ſhining and laſting reputation [*f*].

[*x*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 255.

[*y*] COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 135. *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 213.

[*z*] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 84.

[*a*] For an account of RADBERT, ſee the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 287.

[*b*] We ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more particularly of BERTRAMN, and his book, in the following chapter.

[*c*] It is proper to obſerve, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to HAYMO, biſhop of *Halberſtadt*, were compoſed by REMI, or REMIGIUS, of *Auxerre*. See CASIMIR OUDINUS, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. ii. p. 330. *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 111. tom. vi. p. 106. LE BEUF, *Recueil de Diſſ. ſur l'Hiſtoire de la France*, tom. i. p. 278.

[*d*] See the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 544.

[*e*] *Ibid.* tom. v. p. 416.

It is ſufficient barely to name Remigius Bertharius, Ado, Aimoin Heric, Regino, abbot of *Prum*, and others, of whom the moſt common writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory give ample accounts.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

The miſerable ſtate of Chriſtianity.

I. THE zeal of Charlemagne for the intereſts of Chriſtianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themſelves diligently to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and to the purſuit of religious truth; and as long as this eminent ſet of divines remained, the weſtern provinces were happily preſerved from many errors, and from a variety of ſuperſtitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age ſeveral men of eminent talents, whoſe productions ſhew that the luſtre of true erudition and theology was not, as yet, totally eclipſed. But theſe illuſtrious luminaries of the church diſappeared one after the other, and barbariſm and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, reſumed their ancient ſeats, and brought in their train a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious ſuperſtitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardor theſe ſuperſtitious innovations, than the ſacerdotal orders, the ſpiritual guides of a deluded people. And if we inquire how it came to paſs, that the clergy were ſo zealous in ſuch an inglorious cauſe, we ſhall find that this zeal was, in ſome, the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition; ſince much was to be gained both in point of authority and opulence from the progreſs of ſuperſtition. Chriſtianity among the Greeks and Orientals was almoſt in the ſame declining and deplorable ſtate; though there aroſe, from time to time, in the eaſtern provinces, men of ſuperior abilities, who endeavoured to ſupport the cauſe of true religion, and to raiſe it from the preſſures under which it laboured.

The cauſes to which it was owing.

II. The cauſes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Chriſtian church with ſuperſtition and darkneſs, will appear evident to ſuch as are at all acquainted with the hiſtory of theſe times. The Oriental doctors, miſerably divided among themſelves, and involved in the bittereſt contentions and quarrels with the weſtern churches, loſt all notion of the true ſpirit and genius of Chriſtianity, and, corrupted and biaſſed by the prejudices and paſſions, that are generally excited and nouriſhed by ill-managed controverſy, became incapable of promoting the true and eſſential intereſts of religion. Intent alſo upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine and diſcipline againſt the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themſelves the worſhip of images which began to be warmly oppoſed, they advanced many things in the courſe of theſe diſputes, that were highly erroneous, and as one error follows another, their number increaſed from day to day. The ſavage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whoſe number was prodigious, and whoſe authority was conſiderable, who haunted the woods and deſarts, the gloomy ſcenes of their extravagant devotion, contributed much, among other cauſes, to the decay of ſolid and rational piety. Add to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the weſt, the atrocious exploits of uſurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of all the various branches of learning, the ambitious frenzy of the Roman pontifs, who were inceſſantly gaping after new acceſſions of authority and dominion, the frauds and tricks of the monaſtic orders carried on under the ſpecious maſk of religion, and then we ſhall ſee the true cauſes that founded the empire of ſuperſtition and error upon the ruins of virtue, piety, and reaſon.

[*f*] See Herm. Conringius, *Antiq. Academicæ*, p. 309. *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 416.

The corrupt ignorance and ſuperſtition that reigned in this century appear even in the ſingle inſtance of the fooliſh veneration that was paid to the ſaints and their relics.

III. The ignorance and corruption that diſhonoured the Chriſtian church, in this century, were great beyond meaſure; and were there no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the ſingle inſtance of that ſtupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcaſes of departed ſaints; this would be ſufficient to convince us of the deplorable progreſs of ſuperſtition. This idolatrous devotion was now conſidered as the moſt ſacred and momentous branch of religion, nor did any dare to entertain the ſmalleſt hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had aſſured themſelves of the protection and interceſſion of ſome one or other of the ſaintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Chriſtian had their particular patron among the ſaints, from an apprehenſion that their ſpiritual intereſts would be but indifferently managed by thoſe, who were already employed about the ſouls of others; for they judged, in this reſpect, of the ſaints as they did of mortals, whoſe capacity is too limited to comprehend a vaſt variety of objects. This notion rendered it neceſſary to multiply prodigiouſly the number of the ſaints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmoſt zeal. The prieſts and monks ſet their invention at work, and peopled, at diſcretion, the inviſible world with imaginary protectors. They diſpelled the thick darkneſs, which covered the pretended ſpiritual exploits of many holy men; and they invented both names and hiſtories of ſaints [*g*] that never exiſted, that they might not be at a loſs to furniſh the credulous and wretched multitude with objects proper to perpetuate their ſuperſtition and to nouriſh their confidence. Many choſe their own guides, and committed their ſpiritual intereſts either to phantoms of their own creation, or to diſtracted fanatics, whom they eſteemed as ſaints, for no other reaſon, than their having lived like mad-men.

The ſaints canonized.

IV. The eccleſiaſtical councils found it neceſſary, at length, to ſet limits to the licentious ſuperſtition of thoſe ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have ſtill more friends at court, for ſuch were their groſs notions of things, were daily adding new ſaints to the liſt of their celeſtial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a ſolemn decree that no departed Chriſtian ſhould be conſidered as a member of the ſaintly order before the biſhop in a provincial council, and in preſence of the people had pronounced him worthy of that diſtinguiſhed honour [b]. This remedy, feeble and illuſory as it was, contributed, in ſome meaſure, to reſtrain the fanatical temerity of the ſaint-makers; but, in its conſequences, it was the occaſion of a new acceſſion of power to the Roman pontif. Even ſo early as this century many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not abſolutely neceſſary, that the deciſions of biſhops and councils ſhould be confirmed by the conſent and authority of the Roman pontif, whom they conſidered as the ſupreme and univerſal biſhop; and this will not appear ſurprizing to any who reflect upon the enormous ſtrides, which the biſhops of *Rome* made towards unbounded dominion in this barbarous and ſuperſtitious age, whoſe corruption and darkneſs were peculiarly favorable to their ambitious pretenſions. It is true, we have no example of any perſon ſolemnly ſainted by the biſhop of *Rome* alone, before the xth century [i], when Udalric, biſhop of *Augſburg*, received this dignity in a formal manner from John XV. It is however certain, that before that time, the Roman pontifs were conſulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment reſpected in the choice of thoſe, that were to be honoured with ſaintſhip [k]; and it was by ſuch ſteps as theſe, that the church of *Rome* engroſſed to itſelf the creation of theſe tutelary divinities, which, at length, was diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Canonization*.

[*g*] See Dr. MIDDLETON's letter from *Rome*, *paſſim*, in which we find the names of St. BACCHO, St. VIAR, St. AMPHIBOLUS, EUODIA, &c.

Lives of the ſaints.

V. This prepoſterous multiplication of ſaints was a new ſource of abuſes and frauds. It was thought neceſſary to write the lives of theſe celeſtial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the reſources of forgery and fable exhauſted to celebrate exploits which had never been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy perſons who had never exiſted. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of theſe trifling legends, the greateſt part of which were, undoubtedly, forged after the time of Charlemagne by the monaſtic writers, who had both the inclination and leiſure to edify the church by theſe pious frauds. The ſame impoſtors, who peopled the celeſtial regions with fictitious ſaints, employed alſo their fruitful inventions in embelliſhing with falſe miracles, and various other impertinent forgeries, the hiſtory of thoſe, who had been really martyrs or confeſſors in the cauſe of Christ; theſe fictions, however, did not paſs with impunity, but were ſeverely cenſured by ſome of the moſt eminent writers of the times in which they were impoſed upon the credulity of the public [*l*]. Various were the motives that engaged different perſons to propagate, or countenance, theſe impoſtures. Some were excited to this by the ſeductions of a falſe devotion, which reigned in this perverſe and ignorant age, and made them imagine that departed ſaints were highly delighted with the applauſes and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown with peculiar marks of their favour and protection ſuch as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The proſpect of gain, and the ambitious deſire of being reverenced by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number and to maintain the credit of the legends, or ſaintly regiſters. For the churches, that were dedicated to the ſaints, were perpetually crowded with ſupplicants, who flocked to them with rich preſents in order to obtain ſuccour under the afflictions they ſuffered, or deliverance from the dangers which they had reaſon to apprehend. And it was eſteemed alſo a high honour to be the more immediate miniſters of theſe tutelary mediators, who, as it is likewiſe proper to obſerve, were eſteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illuſtrious. This latter circumſtance offered a ſtrong temptation, to ſuch as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelar ſaints, to ſupply by invention the defects of truth, and to embelliſh their legends with fictitious prodigies; nay, they were not only tempted to this impoſture, but were even obliged to make uſe of it in order to ſwell the fame of their reſpective patrons [*m*].

---

[b] Mabillon, *Act. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc.* v. *Præf.* p. 44. Launoy, *De Lazari, Magdalenæ, et Marthæ in Provinciam appulſu*, cap. i. § 12. p. 342. tom. ii. part. I. Opp. Franc. Pagi *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 259. tom. iii. p. 30.

[i] See Dan. Papebrochius, *De ſolennium canoniſationum initiis et progreſſ. in Propylæo Actor. SS. menſ. Maii*, p. 171; and the other authors who have written upon this ſubject, of which there is an ample liſt in the *Bibliographia Antiquar.* of Fabricius, cap. vii. § 25. p. 270.

[k] See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope Benedict XIV, in his laborious work, *De ſervorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 50. tom. i. Opp. edit. *Roman.* It were to be wiſhed, that hiſtorians of the church of *Rome* would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illuſtrious pontif.

A paſſionate fondneſs for their relics prevails.

VI. But even all this was inſufficient to ſatisfy the demands of ſuperſtition nouriſhed by the ſtratagems of a corrupt and deſigning prieſthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and ſtupid ſons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed ſaints, and to confide in their interceſſion and ſuccours; it was not enough to cloath them with an imaginary power of healing diſeaſes, working miracles, and delivering from all ſorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their cloaths, the apparel, and furniture they had poſſeſſed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcaſes were laid, were treated with a ſtupid veneration, and ſuppoſed to retain the marvellous virtue of healing all diſorders both of body and mind, and of defending ſuch as poſſeſſed them againſt all the aſſaults and devices of ſatan. The conſequence of this wretched notion was, that every one was eager to provide himſelf with theſe ſalutary remedies, for which purpoſe great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and ſubjected themſelves to all ſorts of hardſhips; while others made uſe of this deluſion, to accumulate their riches, and to impoſe upon the miſerable multitude by the moſt impious and ſhocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and univerſal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to ſatisfy theſe demands, and were far from being nice in the methods they uſed for that end. The bodies of the ſaints were ſought by faſting and prayer inſtituted by the prieſt in order to obtain a divine anſwer, and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accompliſh their deſires; the holy carcaſe was always found, and that always in conſequence, as they impiouſly gave out, of the ſuggeſtion, and inſpiration of God himſelf. Each diſcovery of this kind was attended with exceſſive demonſtrations of joy, and animated the zeal of theſe devout ſeekers to enrich the church ſtill more and more with this new kind of treaſure. Many traveled with this view into the eaſtern provinces, and frequented the places, which Christ and his diſciples had honoured with their preſence, that, with the bones and other ſacred remains of the firſt heralds of the goſpel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling conſciences, ſave ſinking ſtates, and defend their inhabitants from all ſorts of calamities. Nor did theſe pious travellers return home empty; the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks found a rich prey in the ſtupid credulity of the Latin relic-hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid conſiderable ſums for legs and arms, ſkulls and jaw-bones (ſeveral of which were Pagan, and ſome not human) and other things that were ſuppoſed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Chriſtian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the poſſeſſion of thoſe celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James, St. Bartholomew, Cyprian, Pantaleon, and others, which they ſhew at this day with ſo much oſtentation. But there were many, who, unable to procure for themſelves theſe ſpiritual treaſures by voyages and prayers, had recourſe to violence and theft; for all ſorts of means and all ſorts of attempts in a cauſe of this nature were conſidered, when ſucceſsful, as pious and acceptable to the ſupreme being [*n*].

[*l*] See SERVATUS LUPUS's *Vita Maximini*, p. 275, 276. and the candid and learned obſervations upon this ſubject that are to be found in various places of the works of the celebrated LAUNOY; *e. g.* in his *Diſpunctio Epiſtolæ Petri de Marca, de tempore quo in Gallia Chriſti fides recepta*, cap. xiv. p. 110. in his *Diſſertationes de primis Chriſtianæ relig. in Gallia initiis*, Diſſ. ii. p. 142. 144, 145. 147. 168, 169 181.—*De Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ in Galliam appulſu*, p. 340.—*De Duobus Dionyſiis*, p. 527. 529, 530. tom. ii. part. I. Opp.—See alſo MARTENE *Theſaurus Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 151.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 273.

[*m*] Of all the lives of the ſaints written in this century, none are more liable to ſuſpicion than thoſe drawn up by the Britons and Normans. See MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc.* i. *Benedictin. ſub init.*

The expoſition of the ſcriptures neglected among the Greeks.

VII. The ſtudy of the holy ſcriptures languiſhed much among the Greeks in this century. Photius, who compoſed a book of *Queſtions* [*o*], relating to various paſſages of ſcripture, *An Expoſition of the Epiſtles of St.* Paul, and other productions of the ſame nature [*p*], was one of the few that em-

---

[*n*] See Muratori *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 6. who gives examples of the truth of this aſſertion.

[(*o*) This work, which is entitled *Amphilochia*, from its having been addreſſed to Amphilochius, biſhop of *Cyzicum*, conſiſts of 308 queſtions and anſwers to them, a ſixth part of which, at leaſt, are to be found in the *Epiſtles of Photius*, publiſhed at *London* in 1651, by biſhop Montague. The moſt of theſe queſtions relate to different texts of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*; but theſe are interſperſed with others of a philoſophical and litterary kind. This work is ſtill extant in MSS in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.]

[(*p*) Such as a *catena*, or *chain*, of commentaries on the book of *Pſalms*, compiled from the ployed their talents in the illuſtration of the ſacred writings. He was a man of great ſagacity and genius, who preferred the dictates of reaſon to the deciſions of authority; notwithſtanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to other commentators. The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the holy ſcriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various paſſages from the commentators of the preceding ages; and this method was the origin of thoſe *Catenæ*, or chains of commentaries, ſo much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a conſiderable number have come down to our times, and which conſiſted entirely in a collection of the explications of ſcripture that were ſcattered up and down in the ancient writers. The greateſt part of the theological writers, finding themſelves incapable of more arduous undertakings, confined their labours to this compiling method to the great detriment of ſacred criticiſm.

Defects of the Latin commentators.

VIII. The Latin commentators were vaſtly ſuperior in number to thoſe among the Greeks, which was owing to the zeal and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, who, both by his liberality and by his example, had excited and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures. Of theſe expoſitors there are two at leaſt who are worthy of eſteem, CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, whoſe *Commentary on St.* MATTHEW, is come down to our times [q]; and the abbot BERTHARIUS, whoſe *Two Books concerning Fundamentals*, are alſo ſaid to be yet extant. The reſt ſeem unequal to the important office of ſacred critics, and may be divided into two claſſes, which we have had already occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory; the claſs of thoſe, who merely collected and reduced into a maſs the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that of a fantaſtic ſet of expoſitors, who were always hunting after myſteries in the plaineſt expreſſions, and labouring to deduce a variety of abſtruſe and hidden ſignifications from every paſſage of ſcripture, all which they did for the moſt part in a very clumſy and uncouth manner. At the head of the firſt claſs was RABANUS MAURUS, who acknowledges that he borrowed from the ancient doctors the materials he made uſe of in illuſtrating the Goſpel of St. MATTHEW, and the Epiſtles of St. PAUL; WALAFRID STRABO, who borrowed his explications chiefly from RABANUS; CLAUDIUS of *Turin*, who trod in the footſteps of AUGUSTIN and ORIGEN; HINCMAR, whoſe *Expoſition of the* IV *Books of Kings* compiled from the fathers, are yet extant; REMIGIUS of *Auxerre*, who derived from the ſame ſource his illuſtrations on the *Pſalms*, and other books of ſacred writ: SEDULIUS, who explained in the ſame manner the Epiſtles of St. PAUL; FLORUS, HAYMO biſhop of *Halberdſtat*, and others, whom, for the ſake of brevity, we paſs in ſilence.

---

writings of ATHANASIUS, BASIL, CHRYSOSTOM, &c. and a commentary upon the *Prophets*, both of which are yet extant in MSS, the former in the *Bibliotheca Segueriana*, or *Coiſliniana*, and the latter in the Vatican library.]

[q] See R. SIMON, *Hiſtoire critique des principaux commentateurs, du Nouv. Teſtament.* chap. xxv. p. 348; as alſo his *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique de M. du Pin*, tom. i. p. 293. who, in his xxvith and xxviith chapter, gives an account of moſt of the writers mentioned here.

Allegoriſts.

IX. RABANUS MAURUS, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers of the fathers, deſerves alſo an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuſe and tedious work, entitled *Scripture Allegories.* To this claſs alſo belong SMARAGDUS, HAYMO, SCOTUS, PASCHASIUS RADBERT, and many others, whom it is not neceſſary to mention. The fundamental and general principle, in which alſo the writers of this claſs agree, is, that, beſides the literal ſignification of each paſſage in ſcripture, there are hidden and deep ſenſes which eſcape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of theſe myſterious ſignifications. Some attribute to every phraſe three ſenſes; others four; others again five; nay, their number is carried to ſeven by ANGELOME, a monk of *Lyſieux*, an acute, though fantaſtic writer, and who is far from deſerving the meaneſt rank among the expoſitors of this century [r].

The ſtate of didactic theology.

X. The teachers of theology were ſtill more contemptible than the commentators, and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Chriſtianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry, and unſatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with ſentences, than to enlighten the underſtanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the moſt part, followed implicitly DAMASCENUS, while the Latins ſubmitted their hood-winked intellects to the authority of AUGUSTINE. Authority became the teſt of truth, and ſupplied in arrogance what it wanted in argument. That magiſterial deciſions were employed in the place of reaſon appears manifeſtly from the *Collectaneum de tribus Quæſtionibus*, of SERVATUS LUPUS; and alſo from a *Treatiſe* of REMIGIUS, *concerning the neceſſity of holding faſt the truths of the goſpel, and of maintaining inviolable the ſacred authority of the holy and orthodox fathers.* If any deigned to appeal to the authority of the ſcriptures in defence of their ſyſtems, they either explained them in an allegorical manner, or, underſtood them in the ſenſe that had been given to them by the decrees of councils, or in the writings of the fathers; from which ſenſes they thought it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Iriſh doctors alone, and particularly JOHANNES SCOTUS, had the courage to ſpurn the ignominious fetters of authority, and to explain the ſublime doctrines of Chriſtianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of reaſon, and the principles of true philoſophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a ſuperſtitious age, and expoſed them to the hatred of the Latin theologiſts, who would not permit either reaſon or philoſophy to meddle themſelves in religious matters [s].

---

[r] See the Preface to his *Commentary on the book of Kings*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of ANGELOME upon the book of *Geneſis*, was publiſhed by BERNARD: PEZIUS, in his *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. i. part. I. but, indeed, the loſs would not have been great had it never ſeen the light.

[s] For an account of the perſecution and hatred that JOHANNES SCOTUS ſuffered in the cauſe of reaſon and liberty, ſee DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Paris*, tom. i. p. 182; as alſo MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* v. 392.

Of Chriſtian morality.

XI. The important ſcience of morals ſuffered, like all others, in the hands of ignorant and unſkilful writers. The labours of ſome were wholly employed in collecting from the fathers an indigeſted heap of maxims and ſentences concerning religious and moral duties, and ſuch, among others, was the work of ALVARUS, entitled *Scintillæ Patrum*. Others wrote in a more ſyſtematic manner concerning virtue and vice, ſuch as HALITGARIUS, RABANUS MAURUS, and JONAS, biſhop of *Orleans*; but the repreſentations they gave of the one and the other were very different from thoſe which we find in the goſpel of CHRIST. Others again, fell into that moſt abſurd and deluſive method of inſtructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantaſtic combination of figures and allegories; and ſeveral of the Greeks began to turn their ſtudies towards the reſolving *caſes of conſcience* [t], in order to remove the difficulties that aroſe in ſcrupulous and timorous minds. We paſs in ſilence the writers of homilies and books of pennance, of which there was a conſiderable number in this century.

The progreſs of myſticiſm.

XII. The doctrine of the myſtics, whoſe origin is falſely attributed to DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and whoſe precepts were deſigned to elevate the ſoul above all ſenſible and terreſtrial objects, and to unite it to the deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more eſpecially among the monaſtic orders. And to augment the credit of this fanatical ſect, and multiply its followers MICHAEL SYNCELLUS and METHODIUS, compoſed the moſt pompous and eloquent panegyricks upon the memory of DIONYSIUS, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmoſt exaggeration. The Latins were not as yet bewitched with the ſpecious appearance, and the illuſory charms of the myſtic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect perſons of a lively fancy, and thoſe of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor MICHAEL BALBUS ſent to LEWIS the MEEK, in the year 824, a copy of the pretended works [u] of DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, which fatal preſent kindled immediately the holy flame of myſticiſm in the weſtern provinces, and filled the Latins with the moſt enthuſiaſtic admiration of this new religion. The tranſlation of theſe ſpurious works into Latin by the expreſs order of the emperor [w], who could not be eaſy while his ſubjects were deprived of ſuch an ineſtimable treaſure, contributed much to the progreſs of myſticiſm. By the order of the ſame emperor, HILDUIN, abbot of *St. Denys*, compoſed an account of the life, actions, and writings of DIONYSIUS, under the title of *Areopagitica*, in which work, among other impudent fictions, uſual in thoſe times of ſuperſtition and impoſture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that DIONYSIUS the *Areopagite*, and DIONYSIUS, biſhop of *Paris*, were one and the ſame perſon [x]. This fable, which was invented with unparalleled aſſurance, was received with the moſt perfect and unthinking credulity, and made ſuch a deep and permanent impreſſion upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonſtrations of its falſhood have not as yet been ſufficient to ruin its credit entirely. As the firſt tranſlation of the works of DIONYSIUS, that had been done by the order of LEWIS the MEEK, was probably in a barbarous and obſcure ſtyle, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, at the requeſt of CHARLES the BALD, the publication of which increaſed conſiderably the partiſans of the myſtic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. SCOTUS himſelf was ſo enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philoſophical ſyſtem, and upon all occaſions either accommodated his philoſophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philoſophy.

---

[t] See NICEPHORI *Chartophylac. Epiſtolæ Duæ*, in the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, tom. iii. p. 413.

[u] USSERII *Sylloge Epp. Hibernicar.* p. 54, 55. [The ſpuriouſneſs of theſe works is now univerſally granted by the moſt learned and impartial of the Roman catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened ſeveral ages after the time of DIONYSIUS, and were not at all mentioned until after the fifth century. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. liv. tom. xi. p. 520. edit. *Bruxelles*.]

[w] That theſe books were tranſlated by the order of LEWIS, appears manifeſtly from the *Epiſtle* to that emperor, which HILDUIN prefixed to his *Areopagitica*, and in which (p. 66. edit. *Colon*. 1563.) we find the following paſſage: *De notitia librorum, quos* (Dionyſius) *patrio ſermone conſcripſit, et quibus petentibus illos compoſuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et veſtram ordinationem,* CUJUS DISPENSATIONE INTERPRETATOS, *ſcrinia noſtra eos petentibus reſerat, ſatisfacit.* From this paſſage it is evident that they are miſtaken, who affirm that the Latin tranſlation of the works of DIONYSIUS was not made before the time of CHARLES the BALD. And they err alſo, who, with

The ſtate of polemic or controverſial theology.

XIII. The defence of Chriſtianity againſt the Jews and Pagans was greatly neglected in this century, in which the inteſtine diſputes and diſſenſions that divided the church gave ſufficient employment to ſuch as had an inclination to controverſy, or a talent of managing it with dexterity and knowledge. AGOBARD, however, as alſo AMULO and RABANUS MAURUS, chaſtiſed the inſolence and malignity of the Jews, and expoſed their various abſurdities, and errors, while the emperor LEO, THEODORUS ABUCARA, and other writers, whoſe performances are loſt, employed their polemic labours againſt the progreſs of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant ſyſtem. But it may be obſerved in general of thoſe, who wrote againſt the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning MAHOMET and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reaſon to imagine, they did this deſignedly and knowing the falſhood, or at leaſt the uncertainty of what they alledged againſt theſe infidels, we muſt look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Chriſtians from apoſtaſy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

The controverſy concerning images among the Greeks.

XIV. The conteſts of the Chriſtians among themſelves were carried on with greater eagerneſs and animoſity than the diſputes in which they were

---

MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. ii. lib. xxix. § 59. p. 488. and the authors of the *Hiſt. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 425. inform us, that MICHAEL BALBUS ſent theſe works already tranſlated into Latin to the emperor LEWIS. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into this latter error after reading the following paſſage in the *Epiſtle* above quoted: *Authenticos namque eoſdem* (Dionyſii) *libros Græca lingua conſcriptos, cum echonomus eccleſiæ Conſtantinopolitanæ et cæteri miſſi Michaelis legatione — functi ſunt — pro munere magno ſuſcepimus.*

[x] LAUNOY *Diſſ. de Diſcrimine Dionyſii Areopag. et Pariſienſis*, cap. iv. p. 38. tom. ii. p. I. Opp. as alſo the other writings of this great man concerning the *Two Dionyſius's*.

engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and theſe conteſts were daily productive of new calamities and diſorders which diſhonoured their profeſſion, and caſt a heavy, though undeſerved reproach upon the cauſe of true religion. After the baniſhment of IRENE, the controverſy concerning images broke out anew among the Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain ſucceſs. The emperor NICEPHORUS, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of *Nice*, nor order the images to be taken out of the churches, yet deprived the patrons of image-worſhip of all power to moleſt or injure their adverſaries, and ſeems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous ſervice. But his ſucceſſor MICHAEL CUROPALATES, ſurnamed RHANGABE, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the prieſts and monks that maintained the cauſe of images, he favoured that cauſe during his ſhort reign, and perſecuted its adverſaries with the greateſt bitterneſs and cruelty. The ſcene changed again, upon the acceſſion of LEO the Armenian to the empire, who aboliſhed the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the uſe and worſhip of images, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, A. D. 814[*y*]; without however enacting any penal laws againſt their idolatrous worſhipers. This moderation, far from ſatisfying the patriarch NICEPHORUS, and the other partiſans of image-worſhip, only ſerved to encourage their obſtinacy, and to increaſe their inſolence; upon which the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chaſtiſed the fury of ſeveral of his adherents with a deſerved puniſhment. His ſucceſſor MICHAEL, ſurnamed BALBUS, or the *Stammerer*, was obliged to obſerve the ſame conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence, which, in the beginning of his reign, he had diſcovered towards the worſhipers of images, whoſe idolatry, however, he was far from approving; the monks more eſpecially provoked his indignation by their fanatical rage, and forced him to treat them with particular ſeverity. But the zeal of his ſon and ſucceſſor THEOPHILUS, in diſcouraging this new idolatry, was ſtill more vehement; for he oppoſed the worſhipers of images with great violence, and went ſo far as to put to death ſome of the more obſtinate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. Upon the death of THEOPHILUS, which happened in the year 842, the regency was entruſted with the empreſs THEODORA during her ſon's minority. This ſuperſtitious princeſs, fatigued with the importunate ſollicitations of the monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and not a little influenced alſo by their inſolent threats, aſſembled, in the year abovementioned, a council at *Conſtantinople*, in which the decrees of the ſecond Nicene council were reinſtated in their loſt authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their corrupt propenſity to image-worſhip by a law which encouraged that wretched idolatry [*z*]. So that after a controverſy, which had been carried on during the ſpace of an hundred and ten years, the cauſe of idolatry triumphed over the dictates of reaſon and chriſtianity; the whole eaſt, the Armenians excepted, bowed down before the victorious images; nor did any of the ſucceeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this ſuperſtitious frenzy, or reſtrain them in the performance of this childiſh worſhip. The council that was held at *Conſtantinople* under PHOTIUS, in the year 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks the *Eighth general council*, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, by maintaining the ſanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The ſuperſtitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the moſt ignominious manner, eſteemed this council as a moſt ſignal bleſſing derived to them from the immediate interpoſition of heaven, and accordingly inſtituted in commemoration thereof an anniverſary feſtival, which was called the *Feaſt of Orthodoxy* [a].

[*y*] FLEURY and ſome other writers place the meeting of this council in the year 815.

[*z*] See FRED. SPANHEIM *Hiſtoria Imaginum*, ſect. viii. p. 845. tom. ii. Opp.—LENFANT *Preſervatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome*, tom. iii. lettre xiv. p. 147. lett. xviii, xix. p. 509.

Among the Latins.

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithſtanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontifs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former maintained as yet that invaluable, and indeed inalienable, privilege of judging for themſelves in religious matters, and were far from being diſpoſed to ſubmit their reaſon implicitly to the deciſions of the pontif, or to look upon any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The moſt of the European Chriſtians, as we have ſeen already, ſteered a middle courſe between the idolaters and the Iconoclaſts, between thoſe who were zealous for the worſhip of images, on the one hand, and thoſe who were averſe to all uſe of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be ſuffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the perſons they repreſented; but they deteſted all thoughts of paying them the leaſt marks of religious homage or adoration. MICHAEL BALBUS, when he ſent, in the year 824, a ſolemn embaſſy to LEWIS the MEEK, to renew and confirm the treaties of friendſhip and peace that had been concluded between his predeceſſors in the empire and CHARLEMAGNE, charged his miniſters, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks [b] to the party of the Iconoclaſts, that they might gradually ſuppreſs, by their united influence, the worſhip of images, and thus reſtore concord and tranquillity to the church. LEWIS, upon this occaſion, aſſembled a council at *Paris* A. D. 824 [c], in order to examine the propoſal

---

[a] See GRETSER. *Obſervat. in Codinum de officiis Aulæ et Eccleſ. Conſtantinopolitanæ*, lib. iii. c. viii. as alſo the *Ceremoniale Byzantinum*, lately publiſhed by REISK, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

[(b) So MICHAEL and his ſon THEOPHILUS ſtyle LEWIS in their letter to him, refuſing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right in conſequence of the treaties which they now deſired to renew.]

[(c) FLEURY, LE SUEUR, and other hiſtorians, place unanimouſly this council in the year 825. It may be proper to obſerve here, that the proceedings of this council evidently ſhew that the deciſions of the Roman pontif were by no means looked upon at this time either as obligatory, or infallible. For when the letter of pope ADRIAN, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almoſt unanimouſly rejected as containing abſurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the of the Grecian emperor, in which it was reſolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of *Frankfort*, which allowed the *uſe* of images in the churches, but ſeverely prohibited the treating them with the ſmalleſt marks of religious *worſhip*. But in proceſs of time the European Chriſtians departed gradually from the obſervance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind ſubmiſſion to the deciſions of the Roman pontif, whoſe influence and authority grew more formidable from day to day. So that towards the concluſion of this century the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the ſaintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations [d].

Several Iconoclaſts among the Latins.

XVII. Notwithſtanding this apoſtaſy the Iconoclaſts were not deſtitute of adherents among the Latins. The moſt eminent of theſe was CLAUDIUS, biſhop of *Turin*, by birth a Spaniard, and alſo a diſciple of FELIX, biſhop of *Urgel*. This zealous prelate as ſoon as he had obtained the epiſcopal dignity through the favour of LEWIS the MEEK, began to exerciſe the duties of his function in the year 823, by ordering all images, and even the croſs to be caſt out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he compoſed a treatiſe, in which he not only defended theſe vehement proceedings, and declared againſt the *uſe*, as well as the *worſhip*, of images, but alſo broached ſeveral other opinions that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in oppoſition to the Greeks, that the croſs was to be honoured with any kind of worſhip; he treated relics with the utmoſt contempt, as abſolutely deſtitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and cenſured with much freedom and ſeverity thoſe pilgrimages to the holy land, and thoſe voyages to the tombs of the ſaints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely ſalutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble ſtand, in the defence of true religion, drew upon CLAUDIUS a multitude of adverſaries; the ſons of ſuperſtition ruſhed upon him from all quarters; THEODEMIR DUNGALLUS, JONAS of *Orleans*, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO [e] united to overwhelm him with their voluminous anſwers. But the learned and venerable prelate maintained his ground [f], and ſupported his cauſe with ſuch dexterity and force that it remained triumphant, and gained new credit. And hence it happened that the city of *Turin* and the adjacent country were, for a long time after the death

---

ſecond council of *Nice*, relating to image-worſhip, were alſo cenſured by the Gallican biſhops and the authority of that council, though received by ſeveral popes as an *oecumenical* one, abſolutely rejected. And what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican biſhops heretics, nor exclude them from the communion of the apoſtolic ſee. See FLEURY, liv. xlvii.]

[d] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 488.—Id. *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc.* iv. part. I. p. 7, 8.—LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. iv. *ad h. a.* 824.

[(e) In order to do juſtice to the adverſaries of CLAUDIUS here mentioned, it is neceſſary to obſerve that they only maintained the innocence and uſefulneſs of images, without pretending to repreſent them as objects of religious worſhip.]

[f] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 488.—*Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Actor. SS. Ord. Benedict.* p. viii.—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 491. & tom. v. p. 27. 64.—JAQ. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformees*, tom. i. period. iv. p. 38. ed. in 4to.

of CLAUDIUS, much leſs infected with ſuperſtition, than the other parts of Europe.

Continuation of the controverſy concerning the derivation or proceſſion of the holy ghoſt.

XVIII. The controverſy that had been carried on in the preceding century concerning the *proceſſion* (if we may be allowed that term) of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, and alſo concerning the word *filioque*, foiſted by the Latins into the Creed of *Conſtantinople*, broke out now with redoubled vehemence, and from a private diſpute became a flaming conteſt between the Greek and Latin churches. The monks of *Jeruſalem* diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this controverſy, and complained particularly of the interpolation of the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the ſon*, in the abovementioned ſymbol; nor did they ſtop here, but diſpatched to CHARLEMAGNE, in the year 809, a certain eccleſiaſtic of their order, whoſe name was JOHN, to obtain ſatisfaction in this matter [*g*]. The affair was debated in due form, both in a council aſſembled this ſame year at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, and at *Rome*, in preſence of the ſovereign pontif LEO III, to whom the emperor had ſent embaſſadors for that purpoſe. LEO adopted the doctrine which repreſented the Holy Ghoſt as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the ſymbol [*h*], and declared it as his opinion, that the word *filioque*, or *from the ſon*, as it was a glaring interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the ſymbol, and at length ſtruck out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in ſuch a prudent manner as to prevent diſturbance. His ſucceſſors were of the ſame opinion: the word, however, being once admitted not only kept its place in oppoſition to the Roman pontifs, but was by degrees added to the ſymbol in all the Latin churches [*i*].

The controverſy concerning the euchariſt ſet on foot by Paſcaſius Radbert.

XIX. To theſe diſputes of ancient origin were added controverſies entirely new, and particularly that famous one *Concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Chriſt were preſent in the euchariſt*. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church, that the body and blood of CHRIST *were* adminiſtered to thoſe who received the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, and that they were conſequently *preſent* at that holy inſtitution; but the ſentiments of Chriſtians concerning the *nature* and *manner* of this *preſence* were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with preciſion that important point, or preſcribed the manner in which this pretended preſence was to be underſtood. Both reaſon and folly were hitherto left free in this matter, nor had any imperious mode of faith ſuſpended the exerciſe of the one, or reſtrained the extravagance of the other. But in this century PASCASIUS RADBERT, a monk, and afterwards abbot of *Corbey*, pretended to explain with preciſion and to determine with certainty the doctrine of the church on this head, for which purpoſe he compoſed, in the year 831, a treatiſe *Concerning the ſacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt* [k]. A ſecond edition of this treatiſe, reviſed with care and conſiderably augmented, was preſented in the year 845 to CHARLES the BALD, and gave principally occaſion to the warm and important controverſy that enſued. The doctrine of PASCASIUS amounted in general to the two following propoſitions: *Firſt*, that, after the conſecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's ſupper, nothing remained of theſe ſymbols but the *outward figure*, under which the body and blood of CHRIST were really and locally *preſent*; and *ſecondly*, that the body of CHRIST thus preſent in the euchariſt was the *ſame body, that was born of the Virgin, that ſuffered upon the croſs, and was raiſed from the dead*. This new doctrine, and more eſpecially the ſecond propoſition now mentioned excited, as might well be expected, the aſtoniſhment of many. Accordingly it was oppoſed by RABANUS MAURUS, HERIBALD, and others, though they did not all refute it in the ſame method, nor upon the ſame principles. CHARLES the BALD, upon this occaſion, ordered the famous RATRAMN and JOHANNES SCOTUS to draw up a clear and rational explication of that important doctrine which RADBERT ſeemed to have ſo egregiouſly corrupted [l]. Theſe learned divines executed with zeal and diligence the order of the emperor. The treatiſe of SCOTUS periſhed in the ruins of time, but that of RATRAMN is ſtill extant [m], and furniſhed ample matter of diſpute both in the laſt and preſent century [n].

[*g*] See STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 14.

[(*h*) This addition of the word *filioque* to the ſymbol of *Nice* and *Conſtantinople* was made in the vth and vith centuries by the churches of *Spain*, and their example was followed by moſt of the Gallican churches, where the ſymbol was red and ſung with this addition.]

[*i*] See LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccleſ. Francor.* tom. iv. *ad A.* 809.—LONGUEVAL, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. v. p. 151.

And carried on by his adverſary Bertramn.

XX. It is remarkable that in this controverſy each of the contending parties were almoſt as much divided among themſelves, as they were at variance with their adverſaries. RADBERT, who began the diſpute, contradicts himſelf in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains in one part of his book concluſions that he had diſavowed in another. His principal adverſary BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, ſeems, in ſome reſpects, liable to the ſame charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of thoſe, who deny that the body and blood of CHRIST are *really* preſent in the holy ſacrament, and affirm on the contrary that they are only repreſented by the bread and wine as their ſigns or ſymbols. There are, however, ſeveral paſſages in his book which ſeem inconſiſtent with this juſt and rational notion of the euchariſt, or which at leaſt are ſuſceptible of different interpretations, and have therefore given riſe to various diſputes. JOHANNES SCOTUS, whoſe philoſophical genius rendered him more accurate, and ſhed through his writings that logical preciſion ſo much wanted, and ſo highly deſirable in polemical productions, was the only diſputant in this conteſt, who expreſſed his ſentiments with perſpicuity, method, and conſiſtency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were the *ſigns* and *ſymbols* of the *abſent* body and blood of CHRIST. All the other theologiſts of his time fluctuate and waver in their opinions, expreſs themſelves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the ſame tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles concerning the matter in queſtion. From all this, however, it evidently appears, that there was not as yet in the Latin church any fixed or univerſally received opinion concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of *Chriſt* are preſent in the euchariſt.

---

[k] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedict.* ii. p. 539. An accurate edition of RADBERT's book is publiſhed by MARTENE, in the ix *tome* of his *Ampliſſ. Collect. veter. ſcriptor.* p. 378. The life and actions of this wrong-headed divine are treated of at large by MABILLON, in his *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* iv. part. II. p. 126. and, by the jeſuits, in the *Acta SS. Antwerp. ad d.* xxvi *Aprilis.*

[l] For an account of RATRAMN, or BERTRAMN, and his famous book which has made ſo much noiſe in the world, ſee FABRICIUS *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1661.

[(m) A new Engliſh tranſlation of the book of BERTRAMN, prieſt and monk of *Corbey*, *Concerning the* BODY *and* BLOOD *of* JESUS CHRIST *in the ſacrament*, was publiſhed in *Dublin* in the year 1753; to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious Hiſtorical Diſſertation concerning this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended againſt the calumnies and fictions of the Roman catholic writers.]

[n] There is an account, but a partial one, of this controverſy in MABILLON's *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. part. II. *Benedict.* p. viii. which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with BASNAGE's *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 909.

Produces unſeemly diſputes founded upon the imputation of monſtrous conſequences.

XXI. The diſputants in this controverſy charged each other reciprocally with the moſt odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of conſequences from the tenets they oppoſed, a method of proceeding as unjuſt, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence aroſe that imaginary hereſy, that upon the triumphant progreſs of the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation in the XIth century, was branded with the title of *Stercoraniſm*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They, who, embracing the opinion of PASCASIUS RADBERT, believed that the bread and wine in the ſacrament were ſubſtantially changed after the conſecration, and preſerved only their external figure, drew a moſt unjuſt concluſion from the opinion of their adverſaries, who maintained on the contrary that the bread and wine preſerved their ſubſtance, and that CHRIST's body and blood were only figuratively and not really preſent in the euchariſt. They alledged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of CHRIST was digeſted in the ſtomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this conſequence was quickly retorted upon thoſe that imagined it, for they who denied the metamorphoſis of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of CHRIST, charged the ſame enormous conſequence upon their antagoniſts who believed this tranſmutation, and the charge was much more applicable certainly to the latter than to the former. The truth of the matter is, that it was neither truly applicable to the one nor to the other, and their mutual reproaches, moſt wretchedly founded, ſhew rather a ſpirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of *Stercoraniſm* is but a malignant invention; it can never, without the moſt abſurd impudence, be brought againſt thoſe who deny the tranſmutation of the bread into the body of CHRIST; it may indeed be charged upon ſuch as allow of this tranſmutation, though it be a conſequence that none of them, who were not frenetic, did perhaps ever avow [o].

The controverſy concerning *predeſtination* and *grace*,

XXII. While this controverſy was at its greateſt height, another of a quite different kind, and of much more importance, aroſe, whoſe unhappy conſequences are yet felt in the reformed churches. The ſub-ſet on foot by Godeſchalcus.

---

[o] For an account of the *Stereoraniſts*, ſee MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part. II. p. 21. —J. BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, tom. i. p. 926. and a Treatiſe of the learned Dr. PFAFF, publiſhed at *Tubingue* in 1750.

ject of this new conteſt was the doctrine of *predeſtination* and *divine grace*, and its riſe is univerſally attributed to GODESCHALCUS, an illuſtrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the monaſtic order in the convent of *Fulda*, from whence he removed to the monaſtery of *Orbais*, in the dioceſe of *Soiſſons*, where he proſecuted his theological ſtudies with great aſſiduity, but alſo with an inſatiable deſire of ſounding the deepeſt myſteries, and of being *wiſe above what is written*. This eminent eccleſiaſtic, upon his return from *Rome* in the year 847, took up his lodging for ſome time with Count Eberald, one of the firſt noblemen at the court of the emperor LOTHAIRE, where he diſcourſed largely concerning the intricate doctrine of *predeſtination* in preſence of NOTHINGUS, biſhop of *Verona*, and maintained that GOD from all eternity had pre-ordained ſome to everlaſting life, and others to everlaſting puniſhment and miſery. RABANUS MAURUS, who was by no means his friend, being informed of his propagating this doctrine, oppoſed him with all his might. To render his oppoſition more ſucceſsful, he began by repreſenting GODESCHALCUS as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monſtrous hereſies, in ſome letters addreſſed to count Eberald, and to the biſhop of *Verona*. And when the accuſed monk came from *Italy* into *Germany* to juſtify himſelf againſt theſe clamours, and for that purpoſe appeared at *Mentz*, of which RABANUS his accuſer was archbiſhop, he was condemned in a council aſſembled by the latter in that city A. D. 848, and ſent from thence to HINCMAR, archbiſhop of *Rheims*, in whoſe dioceſe he had received the order of prieſthood. HINCMAR, who was devoted to the intereſts of RABAN, aſſembled a council at *Quiercy* A. D. 849, in which GODESCHALCUS was condemned a ſecond time, and was alſo treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Becauſe he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. AUGUSTINE, the imperious HINCMAR degraded him from the prieſthood, and was ſo barbarous as to order him to be whipped with the utmoſt ſeverity until the force of his pain overpowering his conſtancy obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executioners, to burn with his own hands the juſtification of his opinions which he had preſented to the council of *Mentz*. After theſe barbarous proceedings the unfortunate monk was caſt into priſon in the monaſtery of *Hautvilliers*, where he ended his miſery and his days in the year 868, or the year following, maintaining with his laſt breath the doctrine for which he had ſuffered.

The hiſtory of this conteſt.

XXIII. While GODESCHALCUS lay in priſon, his doctrine gained him followers, his ſufferings excited compaſſion, and both together produced a conſiderable ſchiſm in the Latin church. RATRAMN, monk of *Corbey*, PRUDENTIUS, biſhop of *Troyes*, LOUP, or LUPUS, abbot of *Ferrieres*, FLORUS, deacon of *Lyons*, REMI, archbiſhop of the ſame city, with his whole church, all theſe eminent and illuſtrious eccleſiaſtics, with many others whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmoſt zeal and vehemence both in their writings and in their diſcourſe, the cauſe of this unhappy monk, and of his condemned opinions. Some indeed confined themſelves principally to the defence of his perſon and conduct, while others went farther and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion were HINCMAR, his unrighteous judge, AMALARIUS, the celebrated JOHANNES SCOTUS, and others, who all maintained that GODESCHALCUS and his opinions had received the treatment they deſerved. As the ſpirit of controverſy ran high between theſe contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, CHARLES the BALD ſummoned a new council, or ſynod, which met at *Quiercy* A. D. 853, in which, by the credit and influence of HINCMAR, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and of conſequence GODESCHALCUS again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null, and deciſions of a different kind, by which GODESCHALCUS and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were ſubſtituted in their place in a council aſſembled at *Valence* in *Dauphiny*, A. D. 855. This council was compoſed of the clergy of three provinces, *Lyons*, *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with REMI, archbiſhop of *Lyons*, at their head, and its decrees were confirmed, in the year 859, by the council of *Langres*, in which the ſame clergy were aſſembled, and in 860, by the council of *Touſi*, in which the biſhops of fourteen provinces ſupported the cauſe of the perſecuted monk, whoſe death diminiſhed conſiderably the heat of this intricate controverſy [*p*].

What judgment we are to form of this controverſy.

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cauſe, we ſhall find that the debate ſubſiſts ſtill in all its force, and that the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS has in our days both able defenders, and powerful adverſaries. He undoubtedly maintained a twofold predeſtination, one to everlaſting life, and the other to eternal death. He held alſo "that God did not deſire or will "the ſalvation of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and that CHRIST "did not ſuffer death for the whole human race, but for that part of it "only, whom God has predeſtinated to eternal ſalvation." Theſe deciſions, which carry a ſevere and rigorous aſpect, are ſoftly and favorably interpreted by the followers of GODESCHALCUS. They deny, for example, that their leader repreſents God as *predeſtinating* to a neceſſary courſe of iniquity, thoſe whom he has previouſly *predeſtinated* to eternal miſery, and, according to them, the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS amounts to no more than this: "That "God has from all eternity doomed to everlaſting miſery, ſuch as he *foreſaw* "would go on impenitent in a ſinful courſe, and has decreed their ruin in "conſequence of their ſins freely committed and eternally foreſeen: that the "ſalutary effects of the mercy of God and the ſufferings of Chriſt extend "indeed only to the elect, and are made good to them alone; though this "mercy an theſe ſufferings, conſidered in themſelves, belong equally to all "mankind." But this contradictory jargon did not ſatisfy the adverſaries of the Predeſtinarian monk; they maintained, on the contrary, that under ambiguous terms and perplexed ſentences Godeschalcus had concealed the moſt enormous errors, propagating it aſſiduouſly as an article of faith, "That God had not only by an original decree predeſtinated one part of "mankind to eternal damnation, but had alſo puſhed them on by an irre-"ſiſtible neceſſity, by a prepollent force, to thoſe crimes and tranſgreſſions, "which were proper to render that damnation juſt [q]." Without determining any thing upon ſuch an intricate and incomprehenſible ſubject, with reſpect to which ſilence is the trueſt wiſdom, we ſhall only obſerve that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between Rabanus Maurus and Godeschalcus, were the real ſource of the Predeſtinarian controverſy, and of all the calamities in which it involved that unfortunate monk [r].

[*p*] Beſides the common writers, who ſpeak of this controverſy, the curious reader will do well to conſult the more learned and impartial accounts they will find of it in CÆSAR EGASSE DE BOULAY's *Hiſtor. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 178.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part. II. p. xlvii —*Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 352.—USSERII *Hiſtoria Godeſchalchi*, *Hanoviæ* 1662, in 8^{vo}. et *Dublini* 1661, in 4^{to}.—GERHARD. JOH. VOSSII *Hiſtoria Pelagiana*, lib. vii. cap. iv.—Add JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 210.

Hincmar and Godeſchalcus, diſpute concerning the words *Trina Deitas.*

XXV. Another, though leſs important controverſy aroſe about this time concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which run thus; *te, trina Deitas unaque, poſcimus*, which may be thus tranſlated, *O God, who art three, and at the ſame time but* ONE, *we beſeech thee*, &c. Hincmar wiſely prohibited the ſinging theſe words in the churches that were under his juriſdiction from a perſuaſion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconſiſtent with the unity and ſimplicity of the ſupreme being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refuſed to obey this mandate, and Bertramn, who was one of the moſt eminent of that order, wrote a large book to prove the expreſſion *trina Deitas*, or *threefold Deity*, orthodox, from the authority of fathers, which was eſteemed the only criterion of truth in theſe miſerable times. Godeschalcus, who now lay in priſon, heard of this diſpute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured diſſertation ſupported the cauſe of his Benedictine brethren, on which account Hincmar accuſed him of *tritheiſm*, and drew up a treatiſe to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous hereſy. This controverſy, however, was but of a ſhort duration, and the exceptionable paſſage of the hymn in queſtion maintained its credit, notwithſtanding all the efforts of Hincmar, and continued, as before, to be ſung in the churches [s].

---

[q] The cauſe of Godeschalcus has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated Maguin, who publiſhed alſo a valuable edition, which is yet extant, of all the treatiſes that were compoſed on both ſides of this intricate controverſy. This intereſting collection, which was printed at *Paris* in the year 1650, in two volumes 4^to. bears the following title: *Veterum auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Predeſtinatione et Gratia ſcripſerunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Hiſtoria et gemina Præfatione.* Cardinal Noris maintained alſo the cauſe of the Predeſtinarian monk with more brevity, but leſs moderation than Maguin. This brief vindication may be ſeen in the *Synopſis Hiſtoriæ Godeſchalcanæ*, which is inſerted in the 4th volume of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictins, Janſeniſts, and Auguſtin monks maintain, almoſt without exception, that Godeschalcus was moſt unjuſtly perſecuted and oppreſſed by Rabanus Maurus. The jeſuits are of a different opinion; they aſſert in general, and Louis Cellot, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonſtrate in his *Hiſtoria Godeſchalci Predeſtinationi*, publiſhed at *Paris* in 1655, that the monk in queſtion was juſtly condemned and deſervedly puniſhed.

[r] The parents of Godeschalcus conſecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the cuſtom of the times, to the monaſtic life in the monaſtery of *Fulda*. The young monk, however, being arrived at a certain age, ſeemed much diſpoſed to abandon his retreat, to ſhake of his religious fetters, and return again into ſociety; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpoſe by Rabanus Maurus, who kept him, againſt his will, in his monaſtic bonds. Hence a violent conteſt aroſe between theſe two eccleſiaſtics, in which Lewis the Meek was obliged to interpoſe, and hence the furious diſputes concerning predeſtination and grace. See *Centuriæ Magdeb. Cent.* ix. c. 10.—Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.* t. ii. *ad A.* 829. p. 523.

The manner of Chriſt's birth becomes a ſubject of debate.

XXVI. A vain curioſity, and not any deſign of promoting uſeful knowledge, and true piety, was the main ſource of the greateſt part of the controverſies that were carried on in this century. And it was more eſpecially this idle curioſity, carried to an indecent and moſt extravagant length, that gave riſe to the controverſy *Concerning the manner in which Chriſt was born of the Virgin*, which began in *Germany*, and made its way from thence into *France*. Certain Germans maintained, that Jesus proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from thoſe general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human ſpecies; which opinion was no ſooner known in *France* than it was warmly oppoſed by the famous Ratramn, who wrote a book expreſly to prove that Christ entered into the world in the very ſame way with other mortals, and that his Virgin-mother bare him, as other women bring forth their offspring. Pascasius Radbert, who was conſtantly employed either in inventing or patronizing the moſt extravagant fancies, adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and compoſed an elaborate treatiſe to prove that Christ was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the ſame manner as he came into the chamber where his diſciples were aſſembled after his reſurrection, though the door was ſhut. He alſo charged thoſe who held the opinion of Ratramn with denying the virginity of Mary. This fruitleſs diſpute was ſoon huſhed, and gave place to controverſies of ſuperior moment [t].

The firſt controverſy between the Greeks and Latins on the account of Photius.

XXVII. Of all the controverſies that divided Chriſtians in this century the moſt intereſting, though at the ſame time the moſt lamentable, was that which occaſioned the fatal ſchiſm between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous ſpirit of animoſity and contention had, for a long time, prevailed between the biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, and had ſometimes broke out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of theſe contending prelates grew ſtill more keen and vehement about the time of Leo the Iſaurian, when the biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, ſeconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontifs many provinces, over which they had hitherto exerciſed a ſpiritual dominion [u]. But in this century they aroſe to an enormous height and broke forth into a moſt dreadful flame, in the year 858 [w], when the learned Photius was choſen patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, by the emperor Michael, in the place of Ignatius, whom that prince drove from his ſee and ſent into exile. For this violent proceeding, though it was juſtified and applauded by a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* in the year 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. IGNATIUS appealed from this council to the Roman pontif NICOLAS I, who eſpouſed his intereſts, and, in a council aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 862, excommunicated PHOTIUS as unlawfully elected; and his abetters for having been concerned in ſuch an unrighteous cauſe. The new patriarch, however, was ſo far from being terrified or dejected by this excommunication, that he returned the compliment to the Roman pontif, and, in a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, in the year 866, he declared NICOLAS unworthy both of the place he held in the church, and alſo of being admitted to the communion of Chriſtians.

---

[s] There is an account of this controverſy given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of Godeschalcus.

[t] See Lucas Dacherius, his *Spicilegium veterum Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 396.—Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Benedict.* part. II. p. 51.

[u] See Giannone, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 535. 646.—Petr. de Marca, *De concordia ſacerdotis et imperii*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—Lequien, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 96.

[(w) In the original there ſtands 852, but as this is probably an error of the preſs, the tranſlator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.]

XXVIII. The Roman pontif alledged a ſpecious pretext for his appearing in this matter with ſuch violence and exciting ſuch unhappy commotions in the church. This pretext was the innocence of IGNATIUS, whom, upon an accuſation of treaſon, whether true or falſe, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was but a mere pretext; ambition and intereſt were the true, though ſecret ſprings, that directed the motions of NICOLAS, who would have borne with patience, nay, beheld with indifference the unjuſt ſufferings of IGNATIUS, could he but have recovered from the Greeks the provinces of *Illyricum*, *Macedonia*, *Epirus*, *Achaia*, *Theſſaly*, and *Sicily*, which the emperor and PHOTIUS had removed from the juriſdiction of the Roman pontifs. Before he engaged in the cauſe of IGNATIUS, he ſent a ſolemn embaſſy to *Conſtantinople* to demand the reſtitution of theſe provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt. And hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed againſt IGNATIUS, he indulged without reſtraint his own private reſentment, and thus covered with the maſk of juſtice the fury of diſappointed ambition and avarice.

A ſecond conteſt concerning the ſame perſon.

XXIX. While things were in this troubled ſtate, and the flame of controverſy was growing more violent from day to day, BASILIUS the Macedonian, who, by the murder of his predeceſſor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once theſe tumults, and reſtored peace to the church, by recalling IGNATIUS from exile to the high ſtation from which he had been degraded, and by confining PHOTIUS to a monaſtery. This imperial act of authority was ſolemnly approved and confirmed by a council aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* in the year 869, in which the legates of the Roman pontif ADRIAN II, had great influence, and were treated with the higheſt marks of diſtinction [x]. The Latins acknowledge this aſſembly as the VIIIth *oecumenical* council, and in it the religious conteſts between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at leaſt huſhed and ſuſpended. But the controverſy concerning the authority of the Roman pontifs, the limits of their ghoſtly empire, and particularly their juriſdiction in *Bulgaria*, ſtill ſubſiſted, nor could all the efforts of papal ambition engage either IGNATIUS or the emperor to give up *Bulgaria* or any other province to the ſee of *Rome*.

Photius degraded.

---

[x] The writers, on both ſides of this controverſy, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372.

XXX. The conteſt that had ariſen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of Photius was of ſuch a nature, as to admit of an eaſy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious ſpirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of diſcord inſtead of extinguiſhing it, and unhappily perpetuated the troubles and diviſions of the Chriſtian church. In the year 866, he added to the ſee of *Conſtantinople* the province of *Bulgaria*, with which the pontif Nicolas had formed the deſign of augmenting his own ſpiritual dominions, and was moſt bitterly provoked at miſſing his aim. Photius went yet farther; and entered into meaſures every way unworthy of his character and ſtation; for he not only ſent a circular letter to the Oriental patriarchs to engage them to eſpouſe his private cauſe, as the public and momentous cauſe of the church, but drew up a moſt violent charge of hereſy againſt the Roman biſhops, who had been ſent among the new-converted Bulgarians, and againſt the church of *Rome* in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or hereſy, which this imperious and exaſperated prelate brought againſt the Romans, were as follow: *Firſt*, That they faſted on the *Sabbath*, or ſeventh day of the week. *Secondly*, That in the firſt week of Lent they permitted the uſe of milk and cheeſe. *Thirdly*, That they prohibited their prieſts to marry, and ſeparated from their wives ſuch as were married, when they went into orders [y]. *Fourthly*, That they maintained that the biſhops alone were authoriſed to anoint with the holy chriſm baptized perſons, and that they, of conſequence, who had been anointed by preſbyters, were obliged to receive that unction a ſecond time from the hand of a biſhop. *Laſtly*, That they had adulterated the ſymbol or creed of *Conſtantinople*, by adding to it the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the ſon*, and were therefore of opinion that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but alſo from the ſon [z]. Nicolas I, finding the Roman church thus attacked, ſent the articles of this accuſation to Hincmar and the other gallican biſhops in the year 867, deſiring them to aſſemble their reſpective ſuffragans in order to examine and anſwer the reproach of Photius. Purſuant to this exhortation of the pontif, Odo, Aeneas, and Ado biſhops of *Beauvais*, *Paris*, and *Vienne*, as alſo the celebrated Ratramn ſtept forth gallantly into the field of controverſy againſt the Greeks, anſwered one by one the accuſations of Photius, and employed

---

[(y) Photius attributes to this forced and unnatural celibacy of the clergy that multitude of children whoſe fathers were unknown. Remarkable to this purpoſe is the following paſſage from a book of Alvarus Delagius, biſhop of *Sylva* in *Portugal*: *De Planctu Eccleſiæ*; *It were to be wiſhed*, ſays he, *that the clergy had never vowed chaſtity, eſpecially the clergy of* Spain, *where the ſons of the laity are not much more numerous than the ſons of the clergy*.]

[z] See the letter of Photius in the collection publiſhed by biſhop Montague, N. II. p. 47. Other writers mention ten heads of accuſation brought againſt Photius, but ſuch do not diſtinguiſh between the firſt and ſecond controverſy that aroſe between the Greeks and Latins, and they add to the articles, with which this patriarch was charged, thoſe that were drawn up in the time of Michael Cerularius. Certain it is, that in the epiſtle of Photius, which relates only to the firſt controverſy, and is the only criterion by which we ought to judge of it, there are no more heads of accuſation than the five which we have enumerated in the text.

the whole force of their erudition and zeal in maintaining the cauſe of the Latin churches [a].

Reſtored to his ſee.

XXXI. Upon the death of **IGNATIUS**, which happened in the year 878, the emperor took **PHOTIUS** into favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek church in the patriarchal dignity from whence he had fallen. This reſtoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontif **JOHN** VIII, upon condition, however, that **PHOTIUS** would permit the Bulgarians to come under the juriſdiction of the ſee of *Rome*. The latter promiſed to ſatisfy in this the demands of the pontif, to which the emperor alſo ſeemed to conſent [b]; and hence it was that **JOHN** VIII ſent legates to the council which was held at *Conſtantinople* A. D. 879, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that aſſembly, and acknowledged **PHOTIUS** as his brother in **CHRIST**. The promiſes, however, of the emperor and the patriarch were far from being accompliſhed; for after this council the former, moſt probably by the advice, or at leaſt with the conſent of the latter, refuſed to transfer the province of *Bulgaria* to the Roman pontif, and it muſt be confeſſed that this refuſal was founded upon moſt weighty and important reaſons. The pontif, notwithſtanding, was highly irritated at this diſappointment, and ſent **MARINUS** to *Conſtantinople* in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind concerning **PHOTIUS**, and that he entirely approved of the ſentence of excommunication that had been formerly given againſt him. The legate, upon delivering this diſagreeable meſſage, was caſt into priſon by the emperor, but was afterwards ſet free; and being raiſed to the pontificate upon the death of **JOHN** VIII, recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new ſentence of condemnation againſt **PHOTIUS**.

XXXII. This ſentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but about ſix years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of ſublunary grandeur and elevation by a fall which concluded his proſperous days. For in the year 886, **LEO**, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, the ſon and ſucceſſor of **BASILIUS**, depoſed him from the patriarchal ſee, and confined him in an Armenian monaſtery, where he died in the year 891. The death of **PHOTIUS**, who was the only author of the ſchiſms that divided the Greeks and Latins, might have been an occaſion of removing theſe unhappy conteſts, and of reſtoring peace and concord in the church, if the Roman pontifs had not been regardleſs of the demands of equity, as well as of the duty of Chriſtian moderation. But theſe imperious lords of the church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all meaſure, and would be ſatisfied with nothing leſs than the depoſition of all the prieſts and biſhops, who had been ordained by **PHOTIUS**. The Greeks, on the other hand, were ſhocked at the arrogance of theſe unjuſt pretenſions, and would not ſubmit to them on any conditions. Hence a ſpirit of reſentment and irritation renewed the ſpirit of diſpute, which had been happily declining; religious, as well as civil, conteſts were again ſet on foot, new controverſies were added to the old, until the fatal ſchiſm took place, which produced a laſting and total ſeparation between the Greek and Latin church.

---

[a] **MABILLON**, *Præf. ad Sæc.* iv. *Bened.* part. II. p. 55.

[b] **MICH. LE QUIEN**, *Oriens Chriſtianus*, tom. i. p. 103.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Several writers explain the origin of the rites and ceremonies now uſed in the church.

I. THAT religious rites and ceremonies were multiplied from day to day appears evidently from the labours of thoſe writers who began in this century to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their nature, and the purpoſes they ſerved; for the multiplicity alone of theſe religious rites could render the explication of them neceſſary. JOHANNES SCOTUS, ANGELOME, REMI, or REMIGIUS, biſhop of *Auxerre*, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO were the principal authors, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves in this ſpecies of ſacred litterature, to whom we may add AMALARIUS, many of whoſe explanations were, however, refuted by AGOBARD and FLORUS. Their works are generally entitled *De Officiis Divinis*, for in the ſtyle of this age religious ceremonies were called by that name. The labours of theſe pious and learned men in illuſtrating the *ritual* were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into queſtion at leaſt, it is not eaſy to determine, whether they were not as prejudicial to the church in ſome reſpects as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain ſort of ſpiritual nouriſhment to the minds of Chriſtians in their attendance upon public worſhip; but this nouriſhment was both coarſe and unwholeſome. The reaſons alledged for the ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purpoſes they were ſuppoſed to anſwer, were, for the moſt part, not only far fetched, childiſh, and ridiculous, but alſo bore the ſtrongeſt marks of forgery and fiction. It is alſo farther obſervable, that theſe illuſtrations not only encouraged, but augmented prodigiouſly, and that to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies. For who would dare to refuſe their admiration and reverence to inſtitutions which they were taught to conſider as full of the moſt myſterious wiſdom, and founded upon the moſt pious and affecting reaſons.

A general account of theſe rites.

II. It would be endleſs to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and ceremonies, which were now introduced, for the firſt time, and of which ſome were adopted by the whole body of Chriſtians, and others only by certain churches. We ſhall therefore diſmiſs this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the ſources from whence the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the abſurdities of this ſuperſtitious age. The carcaſes of the ſaints tranſported from foreign countries, or diſcovered at home by the induſtry and diligence of pious or deſigning prieſts, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of feſtivals or holidays already eſtabliſhed, but alſo to diverſify the ceremonies in ſuch a manner, that each ſaint might have his peculiar worſhip. And as the authority and credit of the clergy depended much upon the high notion which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit of the ſaints they had canonized, and preſented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was neceſſary to amuſe and ſurprize the people by a variety of pompous and ſtriking ceremonies, by images and ſuch like inventions, in order to keep up and nouriſh their ſtupid admiration for the ſaintly tribe. Hence the ſplendor and magnificence, that were laviſhed upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of coſtly pictures and images, with which they were adorned; hence the ſtately altars, which were enriched with the nobleſt inventions of painting and ſculpture, and illuminated with innumerable tapers at noon day; hence the multitude of proceſſions, the gorgeous and ſplendid garments of the prieſts, and the *maſſes*, that were celebrated in honour of the ſaints [c]. Among other novelties the feaſt of *All-Saints* was added, in this century by GREGORY IV, to the Latin calendar [d]; and the feſtival of St. MICHAEL, which had been long kept with the greateſt marks of devotion and reſpect by the Orientals and Italians, began now to be obſerved more zealouſly and univerſally among the Latin Chriſtians [e].

Superſtition inſinuates itſelf into the tranſactions of civil life.

III. Nor was it only in the ſolemn acts of religious worſhip that ſuperſtition reigned with an unlimited ſway; its influence extended even to the affairs of private life, and was obſervable in the civil tranſactions of men, particularly among the Latin Chriſtians, who retained with more obſtinacy than the Greeks a multitude of cuſtoms, which derived their origin from the ſacred rites of paganiſm. The barbarous nations, which were converted to chriſtianity, could not ſupport the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws and manners of their anceſtors, however inconſiſtent they might be with the indiſpenſable demands of the goſpel; nay, they perſuaded, on the contrary, the Chriſtians among whom they lived, to imitate their extravagant ſuperſtition in this reſpect. And this was the true and original ſource of thoſe barbarous inſtitutions that prevailed among the Latins, during this and the following century, ſuch as the various methods by which it was uſual for perſons accuſed to prove their innocence in doubtful caſes, either by the trial of cold water [*f*], by ſingle combat [*g*], by the fire ordeal [*h*], and by

---

[c] See JO. FECHTII *Liber Singularis de Miſſis in honorem Sanctorum.*

[d] See MABILLON, *De re Diplomatica*, p. 537.

[e] The holidays, or feſtivals, of the ſaints were as yet but few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of FLORUS, publiſhed by MARTENE in the vth volume of his *Theſaurus Anecdotor.* p. 595.

[(*f*) All theſe were preſumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itſelf miraculouſly in favour of the truth. In the trial of *cold water*, the perſon accuſed had the right foot and the left hand bound together, and was, in this poſture, thrown naked into the water. If he ſunk he was acquitted, but if he floated upon the ſurface, this was conſidered as an evidencc of guilt. The moſt reſpectable authors ancient and modern attribute the invention of this ſuperſtitious trial to pope EUGENIUS II, and it is ſomewhat ſurprizing that Mr. BOWER has taken no notice of it in his hiſtory of that pontif. BALUZIUS has inſerted, in the 2d volume of his *Capitularia*, the ſolemn forms of prayer and proteſtation, that EUGENIUS had cauſed to be drawn up as an introduction to this ſuperſtitious practice, and FLEURY and SPANHEIM look upon that pontif as its firſt inventor. On the other hand, father LE BRUN, a prieſt of the oratory, maintains (in his *Hiſtoire Critique des Pratiques Superſtitieuſes*, tom. ii. p. 140, &c. *edit. d'Amſterdam*) that this cuſtom was much more the croſs [i]. It is no longer a queſtion in our days, from whence theſe methods of deciding dubious caſes and accuſations derived their origin; all agree that they were mere deluſions, drawn from the barbarous rites of paganiſm [k], and not only oppoſite to the precepts of the goſpel, but abſolutely deſtructive of the ſpirit of true religion. The pontifs, however, and

---

ancient than Eugenius, and his reaſons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this cuſtom was condemned and abrogated at the requeſt, or rather, by the authority of Lewis the Meek about the year 829. It was however revived afterwards, and was practiſed in the x, xi, and xiith centuries, as we ſhall ſee in the progreſs of this hiſtory. For an account of the trial of *cold water*, Dr. Mosheim refers us, in a note, to Mabillon's *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. i. p. 47. and Roye's *De miſſis dominicis*, p. 152.

The trial by *duel*, or ſingle combat, was introduced towards the concluſion of the vth century by Gondebaud, king of the Burgundians, after that the abuſe of oaths had occaſioned the moſt horrible perjuries, and opened a door to all ſorts of injuſtice. The *duel* was then added to the oath by Gondebaud; the ſucceſsful combatant was ſuppoſed to be in the right, and this barbarous teſt of truth and juſtice was, in ſpite of humanity and common ſenſe, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and derived from them to other nations. It was prohibited firſt in the year 855, in the iiird council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*.

The *fire ordeal* was practiſed in various ways. The accuſed either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk bare-foot upon heated plow-ſhares, whoſe number was increaſed in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him; and ſometimes a glove of red-hot iron was uſed on this occaſion, as we ſee in the xth book of the hiſtory of *Denmark*, by Saxon the *Grammarian*. If in theſe trials the perſon impeached remained unhurt, and diſcovered no ſigns of pain, he was diſcharged as innocent; otherwiſe he was puniſhed as guilty. The firſt account we have of Chriſtians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of Simplicius, biſhop of *Autun*, who lived in the ivth century. This prelate, as the ſtory goes, before his promotion to the epiſcopal order, had married a wife who loved him tenderly, and who, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to ſleep in the ſame chamber with her ſpouſe. The ſanctity of Simplicius ſuffered, at leaſt in the voice of fame, by the conſtancy of his wife's affection, and it was rumoured about, that the holy man, though a biſhop, perſiſted in oppoſition to the eccleſiaſtical canons to taſte the ſweets of matrimony. Upon which the dame, in preſence of a great concourſe of people, took up a conſiderable quantity of burning coals, which ſhe held in her cloaths, and applied to her breaſt, without the leaſt hurt to her perſon or damage to her garments, as the legend ſays, and her example being followed by her huſband with like ſucceſs, the ſilly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. Bricius, or St. Brice (whom Mr. Collier, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p. 231. repreſents by miſtake as the firſt chriſtian who endeavoured to clear himſelf in this way) played a trick of much the ſame nature in the vth century.

The trial by the *croſs* was made by obliging the contending parties to ſtretch out their arms, and he that continued the longeſt in this poſture gained his cauſe.]

[g] Jo. Loccenii *Antiquit. Sueo-Gothicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controverſies by *duel* was practiſed even by the clergy. See Just. Hen. Böemeri *Jus Eccleſ. Proteſtantium*, tom. v. p. 88.

[h] Petr. Lambecius, *Rerum Hamburg.* lib. ii. p. 39.—Usserii *Sylloge Epiſtol. Hibernic.* p. 81.—Johnson. *Leges Eccleſ. Britanniæ.*—Michel de la Roche, *Memoires Litter. de la Grande Bretagne*, tom. viii. p. 391.

[i] See Agobardus, *Contra Judicium Dei*, tom. i. Opp. et *Contra legem Gundobadi*, cap. ix. p. 114.—Hier. Bignonius, *Ad formulas Marculphi*, cap. xii.—Baluzius, *Ad Agobardum*, p. 104.

[(k) Strabo tells us in the vth book of his *Geography*, that while the ſacred rites of the goddeſs *Feronia* were celebrated in a grove not far from mount *Soracte*, ſeveral perſons, tranſported with the imaginary preſence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthuſiaſm, and walked bare-footed over heaps of burning coals without receiving the leaſt damage. The ſame hiſtorian adds, that a ſpectacle ſo extraordinary drew a prodigious concourſe of people to this annual ſolemnity. Pliny relates ſomething of the ſame nature concerning the *Hirpii*. See his *Nat. Hiſt.* book vii. ch. ii.]

the inferior clergy encouraged theſe odious ſuperſtitions, and went ſo far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's ſupper and other rites, in order to give them a chriſtian aſpect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during thi century.

The ancient ſects ſtill in being.

I. THE ſects, that had ſprung up in the earlier ages of the church, ſubſiſted ſtill, without almoſt any change in their ſituations or circumſtances that is worthy of mention. Such of them as were conſiderably numerous fixed their ſettlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Neſtorians more eſpecially and the Monophyſites, ſecure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely induſtrious in maintaining their credit, and alſo diſcovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Chriſtianity among thoſe who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion, that it was only in this century that the Abyſſinians or Ethiopians embraced the ſentiments of the Monophyſites in conſequence of the exhortations addreſſed to them by the doctors of that ſect who reſided in *Egypt*. But this is undoubtedly a wrong account of the matter; for it is certain, that the Abyſſinians, who were accuſtomed to receive their ſpiritual guide from the biſhop of *Alexandria*, commenced Monophyſites in the VIIth century, if not ſooner. For in that period the Arabians made themſelves maſters of *Egypt*, oppreſſed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophyſites ſuch a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their juriſdiction almoſt all the churches that had been eſtabliſhed in *Egypt* [l].

The Paulicians.

II. The Greeks, during the greateſt part of this century, were engaged in a moſt bitter controverſy, or, to ſpeak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a ſect that may be conſidered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which reſided principally in *Armenia*. This pernicious ſect is ſaid to have been formed in *Armenia* by two brothers, PAUL and JOHN, ſons of CALLINICES, and inhabitants of *Samoſatena*, from the former of whom it derives its names; though others are of opinion, that the Paulicians were ſo called from another PAUL, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of JUSTINIAN II [m]. Be that as it may, a certain zealo called CONSTANTINE revived, in the VIIth century, under the government of CONSTANS this drooping faction, which had ſuffered deeply from the violence of its adverſaries, and was ready to expire under the ſeverity of the imperial edicts, and of thoſe penal laws which were executed againſt its adherents with the utmoſt vigour. CONSTANS, JUSTINIAN II, and LEO the Iſaurian, exerted their zeal againſt the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterneſs and fury, and left no method of oppreſſion unemployed, no means of accompliſhing their ruin that were not put in execution; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power, nor all their barbarity exhauſt the patience, or conquer the obſtinacy of that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cauſe, made light of the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine expoſed them. The face of things changed, however, to their advantage towards the commencement of this century, and their affairs carried a more proſperous aſpect under the protection of the emperor NICEPHORUS, who favoured them in a particular manner, and reſtored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty [*n*].

---

[l] *Nouveaux Mémoires des Miſſions de la Compagnie de Jeſus dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—LE GRAND, *Diſſert.* iv.—LOBO, *Voyage Hiſtorique de l'Abyſſinie*, tom ii. p. 18.

[m] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 74. *in* B. WOLFII *Anecdotis Græcis*, tom. i.

Perſecuted anew.

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of ſhort duration; it was a tranſient ſcene that was ſoon to be ſucceeded by yet more dreadful ſufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of perſecution, which had for ſome years been ſuſpended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of MICHAEL CUROPALATES, and LEO the Armenian, who cauſed the ſtricteſt ſearch to be made after the Paulicians in all the provinces of the Grecian empire, and inflicted capital puniſhment upon ſuch of them as refuſed to return to the boſom of the church. This rigorous decree turned the affliction of the Paulicians, who dwelt in *Armenia*, into vengeance, and drove them into the moſt deſperate meaſures. They maſſacred THOMAS, biſhop of *New Cæſarea*, and alſo the magiſtrates and judges which the emperors had eſtabliſhed in *Armenia*; and after avenging themſelves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and from thence infeſted the neighbouring ſtates of *Greece* with perpetual incurſions [*o*]. After theſe reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would ſeem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

The fate of the Paulicians under Theodora.

IV. But the moſt dreadful ſcene of perſecution and bloodſhed that was exhibited againſt theſe wretched heretics, aroſe from the furious and inconſiderate zeal of the empreſs THEODORA. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her ſon, iſſued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative, either of abandoning their principles, or of periſhing by fire and ſword. The decree was ſevere, but the cruelty, with which it was put in execution by thoſe who were ſent into *Armenia* for that purpoſe, was horrible beyond expreſſion; for theſe miniſters of wrath, after confiſcating the goods of above an hundred thouſand of that miſerable people, put their poſſeſſors to death in the moſt barbarous manner, and made them expire ſlowly in a variety of the moſt exquiſite tortures. Such as eſcaped deſtruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received them with compaſſion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their reſidence, which was called *Tibrica*. Upon this, they entered into a league with the Saracens, and, chuſing for

---

[n] See GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Hiſtoriar.* tom. ii. p. 480. *Edit. Pariſ.* p. 379.

[o] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 125.—PETRI SICULI *Hiſtoria Manichæorum*, p. 71.

their chief an officer of the greateſt reſolution and valour, whoſe name was CARBEAS, they declared againſt the Greeks a war which was carried on with the utmoſt vehemence and fury. This bloody war continued during this whole century; the victory ſeemed often doubtful, but the ſlaughter was terrible, and the numbers, that periſhed on both ſides, prodigious. Many of the Grecian provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the dire effects of this cruel conteſt, and exhibited the moſt moving ſcenes of deſolation and miſery [*p*]. During theſe commotions, ſome Paulicians, towards the concluſion of this century, ſpred abroad among the Bulgarians their peſtilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root ſpeedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people that were but lately made converts to the Chriſtian faith [*q*].

Whether or not the Paulicians were Manichæans?

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have been now ſpeaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the teſtimony of PHOTIUS, the Paulicians expreſſed the utmoſt abhorrence of MANES and his doctrine [*r*]. Be that as it may, they were not certainly altogether Manichæans, though they embraced ſome opinions that reſembled certain tenets of that abominable ſect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an eccleſiaſtical government adminiſtred by biſhops, prieſts, and deacons: they had no ſacred order of men diſtinguiſhed by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumſtance from the reſt of the aſſembly: nor had councils, ſynods, or ſuch like inſtitutions any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Sunecdemi*, i. e. companions in the journey of life and alſo *Notarii*. Among theſe there reigned a perfect equality, and they had no peculiar rights, privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to diſtinguiſh them from the people [*s*]. The only ſingularity that attended their promotion to the rank of doctors was, that they changed their lay-names for ſcripture ones, as if there had been ſomething peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whoſe lives and actions are recorded in the ſacred writings. They received all the books of the New Teſtament, except the Two Epiſtles of St. PETER, which they rejected for reaſons unknown to us; and their copies of the Goſpel were exactly the ſame with thoſe uſed by all other Chriſtians, without the leaſt interpolation of the ſacred text; in which reſpect alſo they differed conſiderably from the Manichæans [*t*]. They moreover recommended to the people without exception, and that with the moſt affecting and ardent zeal, the conſtant and aſſiduous peruſal of the holy ſcriptures, and expreſſed the utmoſt indignation againſt the Greeks, who allowed to the prieſts alone an acceſs to theſe ſacred fountains of divine knowledge [*u*]. In explaining, however, the doctrines of the goſpel, they often departed from the literal ſenſe, and the natural ſignification of the words, and interpreted them in a forced and allegorical manner, when they oppoſed their favorite opinions and tenets [*w*]; and ſuch more eſpecially were the deluſive and erroneous explications, which they gave of what is ſaid in the goſpel concerning the inſtitutions of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, and the divine authority of the Old Teſtament, all which they obſtinately rejected. Beſides the books of the New Teſtament, they treated with a particular veneration certain epiſtles of SERGIUS, the moſt eminent and illuſtrious doctor of their ſect.

[*p*] GEORG. CEDRENUS, *Compend. Hiſtor.* p. 541. *Ed. Pariſ.* p. 425. *Ed. Venet.* p. 547, et 429, &c.—ZONARAS, *Annal.* lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 122. *Ed. Venet.* The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, and PETRUS SICULUS, whoſe hiſtory of the Manichæans was publiſhed in Greek and Latin at *Ingoldſtadt*, in 1604, by MATTH. RADERUS. By the account of PETRUS SICULUS that is given by himſelf, we learn that in the year 870, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, he was ſent ambaſſador to the Paulicians at *Tibrica*, to treat with them concerning the exchange of priſoners, and lived among them during the ſpace of nine months; this is ſufficient to give us a high idea of the power and proſperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this eminent writer, that CEDRENUS ſeems to have taken what he has advanced in his *Compend. Hiſtor.* p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from more modern writers, ſuch as BAYLE, in his *Dictionary*, and B. JO. CHRIST. WOLFIUS, in his *Manichæiſmus ante Manichæos*, p. 247. ſeems to be derived from BOSSUET'S *Hiſtoire des Variations des Egliſes Proteſtantes*, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for BOSSUET himſelf did not conſult the true ſources of knowledge upon this point, and, what is ſtill worſe, the ſpirit of party ſeems manifeſtly to have led him into *voluntary* errors.

[*q*] It is not improbable that there are yet in *Thrace* and *Bulgaria*, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by ſome. It appears at leaſt certain, that in the laſt century ſome of that ſect ſtill ſubſiſted, and dwelt at *Nicopolis*, as we learn from the teſtimony of URB. CERRI, in his *Etat preſent de l'Egliſe Romaine*, p. 72. who tells us, that PETER DEODATI, archbiſhop of *Sophia*, cauſed them to abandon their errors, and return to the catholic faith; but whether this latter part of the account be true or falſe, is more than we ſhall pretend to determine.

[*r*] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 17. 56. 65.—PETR. SICULUS, *Hiſt. Manich.* p. 43.

[*s*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 31, 32.—PETR. SICUL. p. 44.—CEDRENUS, l. c. p. 431.

The opinions of the Paulicians.

VI. None of the Greek writers have given a complete view of the Paulician ſyſtem, which was undoubtedly compoſed of a great variety of tenets; they content themſelves with mentioning ſix monſtrous errors, which, in their eſtimation, rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying either the comforts of this world, or the happineſs of the next. Theſe errors are as follows: "1. They deny that this inferior and viſible world is the production "of the ſupreme Being, and they diſtinguiſh the creator of this world and of "human bodies from the moſt high God, who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnoſtic ſects, that the Paulicians were looked upon as Manichæans by the Greeks. But what their ſentiments were concerning the creator of this world, and whether or not they conſidered him as a Being diſtinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a ſatisfactory manner. We learn only from PHOTIUS, that according to the Paulician doctrine, the *evil principle* was engendred by *darkneſs* and *fire*: from whence it plainly follows that he was neither ſelf-originated, nor eternal [*x*]. "2. They treated contemptuouſly the Virgin MARY;"

[*t*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 11.—PETR. SICUL. p. 19.

[*u*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 101.—PETR. SICUL. p. 57.

[*w*] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 12.

[*x*] PHOTIUS, lib. ii. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the Oriental philoſophers, from whom the Gnoſtics and Manichæans derived their origin, conſidered *eternal matter*, as the ſeat and the ſource of all evil; but they believed at the ſame time, like many of the Gnoſtics, that this *matter*, endued from all eternity with

that is to ſay, according to the manner of ſpeaking uſual among the Greeks, they refuſed to adore and worſhip her. For they did not deny that CHRIST was the ſon of MARY, and was born of her; although they maintained, as appears from the expreſs teſtimony of their adverſaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human nature, and that MARY, after the birth of CHRIST, had other children by JOSEPH; they only fell into the ſentiments of the Valentinians, and held that CHRIST paſſed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure ſtream of limpid water paſſes through a conduit, and that MARY did not preſerve her virginity to the end of her days; all which aſſertions the Greeks rejected with the utmoſt antipathy and abhorrence. "3. They refuſed to celebrate the holy inſtitution "of the Lord's ſupper;" for as they looked upon many precepts and injunctions of the goſpel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, ſo they underſtood by the bread and wine, which CHRIST is ſaid to have adminiſtred to his diſciples at his laſt ſupper, the divine diſcourſes and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a ſpiritual food and nouriſhment to the ſoul, and fill it with repoſe, ſatisfaction, and delight [*y*]. "4. They "loaded the croſs of CHRIST with contempt and reproach;" by which we are only to underſtand, that they refuſed to follow the abſurd and ſuperſtitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the croſs, a certain ſort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that CHRIST was cloathed with an etherial, impaſſible, and celeſtial body, they could by no means grant that he was *really* nailed to the croſs, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally aroſe that treatment of the croſs of which the Greeks accuſed them. "5. They rejected, after "the example of the greateſt part of the Gnoſtics, the books of the Old "Teſtament, and looked upon the writers of that ſacred hiſtory, as inſpired "by the creator of this world, and not by the ſupreme God. 6. They "excluded preſbyters and elders from all part in the adminiſtration of the "church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refuſed to call their doctors by the name of *Preſbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people, who perſecuted JESUS CHRIST, and attemped, as the Paulicians ſpeak, to put him to death [*z*].

---

life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, miſery, and diſorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material ſubſtances: while God is the creator and father of ſpirits. Theſe tenets reſemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine, yet they differ from it in ſeveral points. It appears moſt probable, that the Paulicians were a branch of ſome of the ancient Gnoſtic ſects, which were extremely numerous and diverſified, and which, though perſecuted and oppreſſed from age to age in the moſt rigorous manner by many emperors, could never be entirely ſuppreſſed, nor totally extirpated.

[*y*] The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning *baptiſm*; it is however certain, that the accounts of that ſacred inſtitution, which are given in ſcripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant ſect; and PHOTIUS, in his *Firſt Book againſt the Manichæans*, p. 29. expreſly aſſerts, that the Paulicians treated baptiſm as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptiſmal water underſtood the *goſpel*.

[*z*] Theſe ſix famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichæan hiſtory of PETRUS SICULUS, with whom PHOTIUS and CEDRENUS agree, although their accounts of theſe opinions be leſs perſpicuous and diſtinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the reſult of my own reflexions upon the Paulician ſyſtem, and the doctrine of the Greeks.

THE TENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

The propagation of the Chriſtian religion.

I. THE deplorable ſtate of chriſtianity in this century, ariſing partly from that aſtoniſhing ignorance that gave a looſe rein both to ſuperſtition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of cauſes of another kind, is unanimouſly lamented by the various writers, who have tranſmitted to us the hiſtory of theſe miſerable times. Yet amidſt all this darkneſs ſome gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and ſeveral occurrences happened, which deſerve a place in the proſperous annals of the church. The Neſtorians in *Chaldæa* extended their ſpiritual conqueſts beyond mount *Imaus*, and introduced the Chriſtian religion into *Tartary*, properly ſo called, whoſe inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural ſtate of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and ſavage. The ſame ſucceſsful miſſionaries ſpred, by decrees, the knowledge of the goſpel among that moſt powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name of *Karit*, and bordered on *Kathay*, or on the northern part of *China* [*a*]. The laborious induſtry of this ſect, and their zeal for the propagation of the Chriſtian faith, deſerve, no doubt, the higheſt encomiums; it muſt, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worſhip, which they introduced among theſe Barbarians, were far from being, in all reſpects, conformable to the precepts of the goſpel, or to the true ſpirit and genius of the Chriſtian religion.

[*a*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Bibliotheca Oriental. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 482.—HERBELOT, *Bibliotheque Oriental*, p. 256.

Preſter John.

II. The prince of that country, whom the Neſtorians converted to the Chriſtian faith, aſſumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of JOHN after his baptiſm, to which he added the ſurname of *Preſbyter*, from a principle of modeſty. Hence it was, as ſome learned men imagine, that the ſucceſſors of this monarch retained theſe names until the time of GENGIS KAN, who flouriſhed in the fourteenth century, and were, each of them called PRESTER JOHN [*b*]. But all this has a very fabulous air; at leaſt, it is advanced without any ſolid proof; nay, it appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous PRESTER JOHN, who made ſo much noiſe in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of *Aſia* before the concluſion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain beyond all contradiction, that the monarchs of the nation called *Karit*, which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by ſome denominated a province of the Turks, and by others a tribe of the Tartars, embraced Chriſtianity in this century; and that a conſiderable part of *Tartary*, or *Aſiatic Scythia*, lived under the ſpiritual juriſdiction of biſhops, which were ſent among them by the Neſtorian pontif [*c*].

Rollo firſt duke of Normandy converted.

III. If we turn our eyes to the weſtern world, we ſhall find the goſpel making its way with more or leſs rapidity through the moſt rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate ROLLO, ſon of a Norwegian count, being baniſhed from his native land [*d*], had in the preceding century, put himſelf at the head of a reſolute band of Normans, and ſeized upon one of the maritime provinces of *France*, from whence he infeſted the whole country round about with perpetual incurſions and depredations. In the year 912, this valiant chief embraced, with his whole army, the Chriſtian faith, and that upon the following occaſion: CHARLES the Simple, who wanted both reſolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourſe to the method of negotiation. He accordingly offered to make over to ROLLO a conſiderable part of his territories, upon condition that the latter would conſent to a peace, eſpouſe his daughter GISELA [*e*], and embrace Chriſtianity. Theſe terms were accepted by ROLLO without the leaſt heſitation; and his army, following the example of their leader, profeſſed a religion of which they were totally ignorant [*f*]. Theſe Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were abſolutely without religion of every kind, and therefore were not reſtrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which preſented to them the moſt advantageous proſpects. They knew no diſtinction between intereſt and duty, and they eſtimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It was from this ROLLO, who received at his baptiſm the name of ROBERT, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of *Bretagne*, and a part of *Neuſtria*, which CHARLES the Simple conveyed to his ſon-in-law by a ſolemn grant, were, from this time, known by the name of *Normandy* [g], which they derived from their new poſſeſſors.

[*b*] See ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 282.

[*c*] The late learned Mr. B. THEOPHILUS, SIGEFRED BAYER, in his *Preface to the Muſeum Sinicum*, p. 145. informed us of his deſign to give the world an accurate account of the Neſtorian churches eſtabliſhed in *Tartary* and *China*, drawn from ſome curious ancient records, and monuments that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled *Hiſtoria Eccleſiarum Sinicarum, et Septemtrionalis Aſiæ*; but death prevented the execution of this intereſting plan, and alſo of ſeveral others, which this great man had formed, and which would have undoubtedly caſt a new light upon the hiſtory of the Aſiatic Chriſtians.

[*d*] HOLBERGI *Hiſtoria Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societat. Scient. Hafnienſ.* part. III. p. 357.

[(*e*) Other writers more politely repreſent the offer of GISELA as one of the methods that CHARLES employed to obtain a peace with ROLLO.]

[*f*] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 296.—DANIEL, *Hiſtoire de France*, tom. ii. p. 587.

The converſion of the Poliſh nation.

IV. The Chriſtian religion was introduced into *Poland* by the zealous efforts of female piety. DAMBROWKA, daughter of BOLISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia*, perſuaded, by the force of repeated exhortations, her huſband MICISLAUS, duke of *Poland*, to abandon paganiſm, in conſequence of which he embraced the goſpel, A. D. 965. The account of this agreeable event was no ſooner brought to *Rome*, than the pontif, JOHN XIII, ſent into *Poland* ÆGIDIUS, biſhop of *Tuſculum*, attended with a numerous train of eccleſiaſtics, in order to ſecond the pious efforts of the duke and dutcheſs, who deſired, with impatience, the converſion of their ſubjects. But the exhortations and endeavours of theſe devout miſſionaries, who were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to inſtruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts, and penal laws, the promiſes and threats of MICISLAUS, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obſtinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of puniſhment, and the hope of reward had laid the foundations of Chriſtianity in *Poland*, two national archbiſhops and ſeven biſhops were conſecrated to the miniſtry, whoſe zeal and labours were followed with ſuch ſucceſs, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient ſuperſtitions, and made public profeſſion of the religion of JESUS [h]. It was indeed, no more than an external profeſſion; for that inward change of affections and principles, which the goſpel requires, was far from being an object of attention in this barbarous age.

The Chriſtian religion eſtabliſhed in Moſcovy.

V. The Chriſtian religion was eſtabliſhed in *Ruſſia* by means every way ſimilar to thoſe that had occaſioned its propagation in *Poland*; for we muſt not lay any ſtreſs upon the proſelytes that were made to Chriſtianity among the Ruſſians in the preceding century; ſince theſe converſions were neither permanent nor ſolid, and ſince it appears evidently, that ſuch of that nation, as, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapſed ſoon after into the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors. WLODOMIR, duke of *Ruſſia* and *Muſcovy*, married, in the year 961, ANNE, ſiſter of BASILIUS, the ſecond Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princeſs, by her repeated entreaties, and her pious importunity,

---

[(g) It was *Neuſtria* properly, and not *Bretagne*, that received the name of *Normandy*, from the Normans who choſe ROLLO for their chief.]

[h] DUGLOSSI *Hiſtoria Polonica*, lib. ii. p. 91. lib. iii. p. 95. 239.—REGENVOLSCII *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Slavon.* lib. i. cap. i. p. 8.—HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. I. p. 41.—SOLIGNAC, *Hiſt. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 71.

perſuaded at length her reluctant ſpouſe to receive the Chriſtian faith, and he was accordingly baptized A. D. 987, aſſuming upon that occaſion the name of BASILIUS. The Ruſſians followed ſpontaneouſly the example of their prince; we have, at leaſt, no account of any compulſion or violence being employed in their converſion [i], and this is the true date of the entire eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity among that people. WLODOMIR and his dutcheſs were placed in the higheſt order of the Ruſſian ſaints, and are ſtill worſhiped at *Kiovia*, where they lie interred, with the greateſt devotion. The Latins, however, paid no ſuch reſpect to the memory of WLODOMIR, whom they repreſent as abſolutely unworthy of ſaintly honours [k].

And in *Hungary*.

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received ſome faint notions of Chriſtianity under the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, and in conſequence of the meaſures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the goſpel. Theſe notions, however, were ſoon and eaſily extinguiſhed by various circumſtances which took their riſe from the death of CHARLEMAGNE; and it was not before the century, of which we now write, that the Chriſtian religion obtained a fixed ſettlement among theſe warlike nations [l]. Towards the middle of this century BULOSUDES, and GYULA, or GYLAS, two Turkiſh chiefs, whoſe governments lay upon the banks of the *Danube* [m], made public profeſſion of Chriſtianity and were baptized at *Conſtantinople*. The former apoſtatized ſoon after to the religion of his anceſtors; while the latter not only perſevered ſtedfaſtly in his new profeſſion, but alſo ſhewed the moſt zealous concern for the converſion of his ſubjects, who, in conſequence of his expreſs order, were inſtructed in the doctrines and precepts of the goſpel by HIEROTHEUS, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to *Conſtantinople*. SAROLTA, the daughter of GYLAS, was afterwards given in marriage to GEYSA, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom ſhe perſuaded to embrace the divine religion in which ſhe had been educated. The faith, however, of this new-converted prince was feeble and unſteddy, and he retained a ſtrong propenſity to the ſuperſtition which he had been engaged to forſake; but his apoſtaſy was prevented by the pious remonſtrances of ADALBERT, archbiſhop of *Prague*, who came into *Hungary* towards the concluſion of this century, and by whom alſo STEPHEN, the ſon of GEYSA, was baptized with great pomp and ſolemnity. It was to this young prince that the goſpel was principally indebted for its propagation and eſtabliſhment among the Hungarians, whoſe entire converſion was the fruit of his zeal for the cauſe of CHRIST. For he perfected, what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed biſhops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for divine worſhip; and, by the influence of inſtructions, threatnings, rewards, and puniſhments, he brought his ſubjects, almoſt without exception, to abandon the wretched ſuperſtition of their idolatrous anceſtors. Theſe vigorous proceedings, by which STEPHEN introduced the religion of JESUS among the Hungarians, procured him the moſt diſtinguiſhed honours of ſaintſhip in ſucceeding ages [*n*].

---

[i] See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baron.* tom. iv. *ad A.* 987. p. 55. *et ad A.* 1015. p. 110.—CAR. DU FRESNE, *Familiæ Byzantinæ*, p. 143. ed. *Pariſ.*

[k] DITMARUS, *Merſeb.* lib. vii. *Caronic.* p. 417. tom. i. *Scriptor. Brunſvic. Leibnitii.*

[l] PAULI DEBREZENI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Reformator. in Ungaria*, part. I. cap. iii. p. 19.

[m] The Hungarians and Tranſylvanians were, at this time, known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

In *Denmark.*

VII. The Chriſtian religion was in a very unſettled ſtate among the Danes under the reign of GORMON, and, notwithſtanding the protection it received from his queen, who profeſſed it publicly, was obliged to ſtruggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much oppoſition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of GORMON. His ſon HARALD, ſurnamed *Blaatand*, being defeated by OTHO the Great, A. D. 949, embraced the goſpel, and was baptized together with his conſort and his ſon SUENO, or SWEIN, by ADALDAGUS, archbiſhop of *Hamburg*, or as others alledge, by POPPON, a pious eccleſiaſtic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that HARALD, educated by his mother TYRA, who was a Chriſtian, was not extremely averſe to the religion of JESUS; it appears, however, certain, that his converſion was leſs the effect of his own choice, than of the irreſiſtible commands of his victorious enemy. For OTHO, perſuaded that the Danes would never deſiſt from their hoſtile incurſions, and rapines, as long as they perſevered in the religion of their anceſtors, which was ſo proper to nouriſh a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with HARALD, that both he and his ſubjects ſhould receive the Chriſtian faith [*o*]. Upon the converſion of this prince, ADALDAGUS and POPPON employed their miniſterial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate ſuch an illuſtrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable ſucceſs, to which the ſtupendous miracles performed by POPPON are ſaid to have contributed in a particular manner. Theſe miracles, indeed, were of ſuch a kind, as manifeſtly ſhews that they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interpoſition [*p*]. As long as HARALD lived, he uſed every wiſe and probable method of confirming his ſubjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpoſe he eſtabliſhed biſhops in ſeveral parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated ſuperſtitious cuſtoms, and impoſed ſevere reſtraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But after all theſe pious efforts, and ſalutary meaſures, which promiſed ſuch fair proſpects to the riſing church, his ſon SUENO, or SWEIN, apoſtatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Chriſtians in the deepeſt calamity and diſtreſs, and treated them with the greateſt cruelty and injuſtice. This perſecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy ſtrokes of adverſity, which produced a ſalutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for being driven from his kingdom, and obliged to ſeek his ſafety in a ſtate of exile among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had abandoned, and, upon his reſtoration to his dominions, exerted the moſt ardent and exemplary zeal in the cauſe of Chriſtianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the utmoſt of his power [*q*].

[*n*] The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, claim each for themſelves the peculiar honour of having been the founders of the Chriſtian religion in *Hungary*, and their reſpective pretenſions have introduced not a little obſcurity into this matter. The Germans alledge, that the Chriſtian religion was brought into *Hungary* by GISELA, ſiſter to their emperor HENRY II, who, being given in marriage to STEPHEN, the king of that nation, perſuaded that prince to embrace the goſpel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the miniſtry of ADALBERT, archbiſhop of *Prague*, that STEPHEN was converted. The Poles affirm, that GEYSA, having married a Chriſtian princeſs of their nation, *viz.* ADELHEID, ſiſter to MICISLAS, duke of *Poland*, was induced, by her remonſtrances and exhortations, to make profeſſion of Chriſtianity. In conſequence of a careful examination of all theſe pretenſions, we have followed the ſentiments and deciſions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian hiſtorians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned GABRIEL DE JUXTA HORNAD, who, in his *Initia Religionis Chriſtianæ inter Hungaros Eccleſiæ orientali adſerta*, publiſhed at *Franckfort* in 1740, decides this queſtion in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and ſubject to many doubts and difficulties.

[*o*] ADAM, *Brem. Hiſtor.* lib. ii. cap. ii, iii. p. 16. cap. xv. p. 20. in LINDENBROGII *Scriptoribus rerum Septentrional.*—ALB. KRANZII *Wandalia*, lib. iv. cap. xx.—LUDWIGII *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptor.* tom. ix. p. 10.—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, tom, i. p. 59.

In Norway.

VIII. It was in this century, that the firſt dawn of the goſpel aroſe upon the Norwegians, as we learn from the moſt authentic records. The converſion of that people was attempted, in the year 933, by their monarch HAGEN ADELSTEEN, who had been educated among the Engliſh, and who employed certain eccleſiaſtics of that nation to inſtruct his ſubjects in the doctrines of Chriſtianity. But his pious efforts were rendered fruitleſs by the brutal obſtinacy, with which the Norwegians perſevered in their ancient prejudices, and the aſſiduity and zeal with which his ſucceſſor HARALD GRAUFELDT purſued the ſame plan of reformation, were alſo without effect [*r*]. The ſucceeding princes, far from being diſcouraged by theſe obſtacles, perſiſted firmly in their worthy purpoſe, and HACO, among others, yielding to the entreaties of HARALD, king of *Denmark*, to whom he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced, himſelf, the Chriſtian religion, and recommended it, with the greateſt fervour, to his ſubjects, in an aſſembly of the people that was held in the year 945 [*s*]. This recommendation, notwithſtanding the ſolemnity and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little impreſſion upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zealous endeavours of OLAUS to convert them to Chriſtianity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which procured him the honour of ſaintſhip, was not altogether without effect [*t*]. But that which gave the finiſhing ſtroke to the converſion of the Norwegians was their ſubjection to SUENON, or SWEIN, king of

---

[*p*] JO. ADOLPH. CUPRÆI *Annales Epiſcopor. Sleſvic.* cap. xiii. p. 78.—ADAM *Bremenſ.* lib. ii. cap. xxvi. p. 22. cap. xliv. p. 28.—JO. STEPHAN. *Ad Saxonem Grammat.* p. 207.—MÖLLERI *Introduct. ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſ. Cimbric.* part. II. cap. iii. § 14.

[*q*] SAXON *Gramm. Hiſtor. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186.—PONTOPPIDAN, *De geſtis et veſtigiis Danorum extra Daniam,* tom. ii. cap. i. § 1, 2.

[*r*] ERIC. PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales Eccleſ. Danicæ diplomat.* tom. i. p. 66.

[*s*] TORM. TORFÆI *Hiſtoria Norvegica,* tom. ii. p. 183. 214.

[*t*] TORFÆUS, l. c. p. 457.

Sweden, who, having defeated their monarch OLAUS TRYG-GUESON, became maſter of *Norway*, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their anceſtors, and to embrace univerſally the religion of JESUS [*u*]. Among the various doctors that were ſent to inſtruct this barbarous people, the moſt eminent, both in merit and authority, was GUTHEBALD, an Engliſh prieſt [*w*]. From *Norway*, Chriſtianity ſpred its ſalutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with ſucceſs, in the *Orkney* iſlands, which were, at this time, ſubject to the Norwegian kings, and alſo in *Iceland* and *Old Groenland*; for it is evident, from many circumſtances and records of undoubted authority, that the greateſt part of the inhabitants of theſe countries had received the goſpel in this century [*x*].

The zeal of Otho the Great in the cauſe of Chriſtianity.

IX. In *Germany* the pious exploits of OTHO the Great, contributed, in a ſignal manner, to promote the intereſt of Chriſtianity, and to fix and eſtabliſh it upon ſolid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whoſe pious magnanimity cloathed him with a luſtre infinitely ſuperior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was conſtantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient ſuperſtitions, and in ſupporting and confirming the infant church, which in ſeveral provinces had not yet arrived to any conſiderable degree of conſiſtence and vigour. That there might be rulers and paſtors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpoliſhed and illiterate people, he eſtabliſhed biſhops in ſeveral places, and generouſly erected and endowed the biſhoprics of *Brandenburg*, *Havelberg*, *Meiſſen*, *Magdeburg*, and *Naumburg*; by which excellent eſtabliſhments the church was furniſhed with eminent doctors from various parts, whoſe inſtructions

---

[(*u*) Dr. MOSHEIM attributes here to SWEIN the honour which is due to his predeceſſor OLAUS TRYG-GUESON; if it can be eſteemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulſion and violence, by fire and ſword. OLAUS, who had abjured paganiſm in *England*, during his youth, in conſequence of a warm and pathetic diſcourſe which he had heard from a Britiſh prieſt, returned to *Norway* with a firm reſolution to propagate Chriſtianity throughout his dominions. For this purpoſe he traveled from one province to another, attended by a choſen band of ſoldiers, and ſword in hand performed the functions of miſſionary and apoſtle. His miniſtry, thus enforced, was followed with the deſired ſucceſs throughout all the provinces, except that of *Drontheim*, which roſe in rebellion againſt him, and attacked Chriſtianity with the ſame kind of arguments that OLAUS employed in eſtabliſhing it. This oppoſition occaſioned ſeveral bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god *Thor*, their tutelar deity, whoſe ſtatue OLAUS dragged from its place, and burnt publicly in the ſight of his worſhipers. This event dejected the courage of the inhabitants of *Drontheim*, who ſubmitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus before the reign of SUENON, at leaſt before the defeat of OLAUS by that prince, *Norway* was chriſtian. See *The Hiſtory of Denmark*, lately publiſhed in French by Mr MALLET, Profeſſor in *Belles Lettres* at *Copenhagen*, vol. i. p. 52, 53.]

[*w*] *Chron. Danicum* à LUDEWIGIO *editum in Reliquiis MStorum*, tom. ix. p. 11. 16, 17.

[*x*] Concerning the converſion of the inhabitants of the *Orkneys*, ſee TORM. TORFÆI *Hiſtoria Rerum Orcadenſ.* lib. i. p. 22. and for an acount of the Icelanders, the reader may conſult ARNGRIM. JONAS's *Cynogææ*, lib. i. and ARIUS *Multiſc. in Schedis Iſlandiæ*; as alſo TORFÆUS, his *Hiſtor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 378, 379. 417. and GABRIEL LIRON's *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. i. p. 138.—The ſame TORFÆUS gives a full account of the introduction of Chriſtianity into *Groenland*, in his *Hiſtor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 374. and alſo in his *Groenlandia Antiqua*, c. xvii. p. 127.

were the occaſion of raiſing up new labourers in the goſpel harveſt, and of thus multiplying the miniſters of CHRIST from time to time. It was alſo through the munificence of the ſame prince, that many convents were erected for thoſe who, in conformity with the falſe piety of the times, choſe to finiſh their Chriſtian courſe in the indolent ſanctity of a ſolitary life, and it was by his expreſs order that ſchools were eſtabliſhed in almoſt every city for the education of the youth. All this may ſerve to ſhew us the generoſity and zeal of this illuſtrious emperor, whoſe merit would have ſurpaſſed the higheſt encomiums, had his prudence and moderation been equal to the fervour of his piety, and the uprightneſs of his intentions. But the ſuperſtition of his empreſs [*y*], and the deplorable ignorance of the times, deluded this good prince into the notion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion, as he loaded the clergy with riches and honours, and that nothing was more proper to draw down upon him the divine protection, than the exerciſe of a boundleſs liberality to his miniſters. In conſequence of this idle and extravagant fancy, OTHO opened the ſources of his opulence, which flowed into the church like an over-grown torrent, ſo that the biſhops, monks, and religious houſes wallowed in wealth and abundance. But ſucceeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of this exceſſive and ill-judged munificence; when the ſacred orders employed this opulence, which they had acquired without either merit or labour, in gratifying their paſſions, in waging war againſt all who oppoſed their ambitious pretenſions, and in purchaſing the various pleaſures of a luxurious and effeminate life.

The plan of a holy war formed in this century.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progreſs and ſtrength of the Chriſtian cauſe, that the European kings and princes began ſo early as this century to form the project of a holy war againſt the Mahometans, who were maſters of *Paleſtine*. They conſidered it as an intolerable reproach upon Chriſtians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, exerciſed his miniſtry, and made expiation for the ſins of mortals, ſhould be abandoned to the enemies of the Chriſtian name. They alſo looked upon it as highly juſt, and ſuitable to the majeſty of the Chriſtian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the perſecution and reproach, which its profeſſors had ſuffered under the Mahometan yoke. The bloody ſignal was accordingly given towards the concluſion of this century, by the Roman pontif SILVESTER II, and that in the firſt year of his pontificate. And this ſignal was an epiſtle wrote in the name of the *church of Jeruſalem*, to the *church univerſal throughout the world* [*z*], in which the European powers are ſolemnly exhorted and entreated to ſuccour and deliver the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine*. The exhortations of the pontif were, however, without effect, except upon the inhabitants of *Piſa*, who are ſaid to have obeyed the papal ſummons with the utmoſt alacrity, and to have prepared themſelves immediately for a holy campaign [a].

[*y*] See the life of this empreſs, whoſe name was ADELAID, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of HENRY CANISIUS, tom. iii. part. I. p. 69.

[*z*] This is the XXVIIIth Epiſtle in the firſt part of the collection of the letters of SILVESTER II, that is publiſhed by DU CHESNE, in the IIId volume of his *Scriptor. Hiſtor. Franc.*

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The progreſs of the Turks and Saracens.

I. THE Chriſtian religion ſuffered leſs in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the Pagan monarchs, under whoſe government the Chriſtians lived, none behaved to them in a hoſtile manner, nor tormented them with the execution of compulſive edicts or penal laws, except Gormon and Swein, kings of *Denmark*. Notwithſtanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flouriſhing ſtate; nay, their ſituation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces. The Saracens in *Aſia* and *Africa*, amidſt the inteſtine diviſions under which they groaned, and the calamities that over-whelmed them from different quarters, were extremely aſſiduous in propagating every where the doctrines of Mahomet, nor were their efforts unſucceſsful. Multitudes of Chriſtians fell into their ſnares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coaſt of the *Caſpian* ſea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a ſolid union of intereſts between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their diſſenſions and quarrels were never more violent, than from the time that Mahomet became their common chief in religious matters. The ſuccours of the former were implored by the Perſians, whoſe country was a prey to the ambitious uſurpations of the latter, and theſe ſuccours were granted with the utmoſt alacrity and readineſs. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Perſian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and ſucceſs, invaded, ſeized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whoſe deſolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for ſo many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at laſt by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accompliſhed, what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they ſtruck ſuddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in *Perſia*, and then deprived them, by degrees, of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which was ſtill an object of terror to the Chriſtians, was eſtabliſhed upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion [b].

The weſtern Barbarians perſecute the Chriſtians.

II. In the weſtern provinces the Chriſtians had much to ſuffer from the hatred and cruelty of thoſe who remained under the darkneſs of paganiſm.

---

[a] See Muratori *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iii. p. 400.

[b] For a more ample account of theſe revolutions, ſee the *Annales Turcici* of Leunclavius; as alſo Georgii Elmacini *Hiſtoria Saracenica*, p. 190. 203. 210.

The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in ſeveral parts of *France*, the moſt barbarous hoſtilities, and involved the Chriſtians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberleſs calamities. The Sarmatians, Sclavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an averſion for the goſpel, or were ſunk in a ſtupid ignorance of its intrinſic excellence and its immortal bleſſings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Chriſtianity out of their own territories by the moſt barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infeſted the adjacent countries, where it was profeſſed, with fire and ſword, and left, wherever they went, the moſt dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not ceaſe to moleſt the Chriſtians, until they were ſubdued by OTHO the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Chriſtian cauſe. The Hungarians, alſo, contributed their part to the ſufferings of the church, by their incurſions into ſeveral parts of *Germany*, which they turned into ſcenes of deſolation and miſery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in *Spain*, and their depredations in *Italy*, and the neighbouring iſlands, ſpred calamity and oppreſſion all around them, of which, no doubt, the Chriſtians eſtabliſhed in theſe parts had the heavieſt portion.

The effects of theſe calamities.

III. Whoever conſiders the endleſs vexations, perſecutions, and calamities, which the Chriſtians ſuffered from the nations that continued in their ancient ſuperſtitions, will eaſily perceive the reaſon of that fervent and inextinguiſhable zeal, which Chriſtian princes diſcovered for the converſion of theſe nations, whoſe impetuous and ſavage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of ſelf-preſervation, and a prudent regard to their own ſafety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the goſpel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adverſaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Chriſtianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of theſe nations, and ſoften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Chriſtian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw theſe infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpoſe, they propoſed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, offered them certain diſtricts and territories, auxiliary troops to maintain them againſt their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors, which was ſo proper to nouriſh their ferocity, and to increaſe their paſſion for blood and carnage. Theſe offers were attended with the deſired ſucceſs, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themſelves to the inſtructions and exhortations of the Chriſtian miſſionaries, but alſo to oblige their ſubjects and armies to follow their examples in this reſpect.

PART II.

The Internal History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

I. THE deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the ſciences ſeemed to be upon the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimouſly confeſſed and lamented by all the writers, who have tranſmitted to us any accounts of this period of time. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear aſtoniſhing to ſuch as conſider, on the one hand, the terrible viciſſitudes, tumults, and wars that turned all things into confuſion both in the eaſtern and weſtern world, and, on the other, the ignominious ſtupidity and diſſoluteneſs of thoſe ſacred orders who had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. Leo, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, who aſcended the imperial throne of the Greeks towards the commencement of this century, was himſelf an eminent lover of learning, and an auſpicious and zealous protector of ſuch as diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the culture of the ſciences [c]. This noble and generous diſpoſition appeared with ſtill a greater luſtre in his ſon Constantine Porphyrogenneta, who not only diſcovered the greateſt ardour for the revival of the arts and ſciences in *Greece* [d], but alſo employed the moſt effectual meaſures for the accompliſhment of this excellent purpoſe. It was with this view that he ſpared no expence in drawing to his court, and ſupporting in his dominions, a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in ſome of the different branches of literature, and in cauſing the moſt diligent ſearch to be made after the writings of the ancients. With this view, alſo, he became himſelf an author [e], and thus animated by his example, as well as by his protection, men of genius and abilities to enrich the ſciences with their learned productions. He employed, moreover, a conſiderable number of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the commentaries, and other

---

[c] See Jo. Alb. Fabricii *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. part. II. cap. v. p. 363.

[d] Fabricius, ibid. cap. v. p. 486.

[e] We have yet remaining of Constantine Porphyrogenneta, ſon of Leo the Philoſopher, the following productions:

The Life of the emperor Baſilius.

A Treatiſe upon the Art of Governing, in which he inveſtigates the origin of ſeveral nations, treats of their power, their progreſs, their revolutions, and their decline, and gives a ſeries of their princes and rulers.

A Diſcourſe concerning the manner of forming a Land Army and a Naval Force in Order of Battle.

Two Books concerning the Eaſtern and Weſtern Provinces.

Which may be conſidered as an account of the ſtate of the empire in the time of this prince.]

The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in ſeveral parts of *France*, the moſt barbarous hoſtilities, and involved the Chriſtians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberleſs calamities. The Sarmatians, Sclavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an averſion for the goſpel, or were ſunk in a ſtupid ignorance of its intrinſic excellence and its immortal bleſſings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Chriſtianity out of their own territories by the moſt barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infeſted the adjacent countries, where it was profeſſed, with fire and ſword, and left, wherever they went, the moſt dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not ceaſe to moleſt the Chriſtians, until they were ſubdued by OTHO the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Chriſtian cauſe. The Hungarians, alſo, contributed their part to the ſufferings of the church, by their incurſions into ſeveral parts of *Germany*, which they turned into ſcenes of deſolation and miſery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in *Spain*, and their depredations in *Italy*, and the neighbouring iſlands, ſpred calamity and oppreſſion all around them, of which, no doubt, the Chriſtians eſtabliſhed in theſe parts had the heavieſt portion.

The effects of theſe calamities.

III. Whoever conſiders the endleſs vexations, perſecutions, and calamities, which the Chriſtians ſuffered from the nations that continued in their ancient ſuperſtitions, will eaſily perceive the reaſon of that fervent and inextinguiſhable zeal, which Chriſtian princes diſcovered for the converſion of theſe nations, whoſe impetuous and ſavage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of ſelf-preſervation, and a prudent regard to their own ſafety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the goſpel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adverſaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Chriſtianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of theſe nations, and ſoften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Chriſtian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw theſe infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpoſe, they propoſed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, offered them certain diſtricts and territories, auxiliary troops to maintain them againſt their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon the ſuperſtition of their anceſtors, which was ſo proper to nouriſh their ferocity, and to increaſe their paſſion for blood and carnage. Theſe offers were attended with the deſired ſucceſs, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themſelves to the inſtructions and exhortations of the Chriſtian miſſionaries, but alſo to oblige their ſubjects and armies to follow their examples in this reſpect.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

I. THE deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the ſciences ſeemed to be upon the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimouſly confeſſed and lamented by all the writers, who have tranſmitted to us any accounts of this period of time. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear aſtoniſhing to ſuch as conſider, on the one hand, the terrible viciſſitudes, tumults, and wars that turned all things into confuſion both in the eaſtern and weſtern world, and, on the other, the ignominious ſtupidity and diſſoluteneſs of thoſe ſacred orders who had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. LEO, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, who aſcended the imperial throne of the Greeks towards the commencement of this century, was himſelf an eminent lover of learning, and an auſpicious and zealous protector of ſuch as diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the culture of the ſciences [*c*]. This noble and generous diſpoſition appeared with ſtill a greater luſtre in his ſon CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, who not only diſcovered the greateſt ardour for the revival of the arts and ſciences in *Greece* [*d*], but alſo employed the moſt effectual meaſures for the accompliſhment of this excellent purpoſe. It was with this view that he ſpared no expence in drawing to his court, and ſupporting in his dominions, a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in ſome of the different branches of literature, and in cauſing the moſt diligent ſearch to be made after the writings of the ancients. With this view, alſo, he became himſelf an author [*e*], and thus animated by his example, as well as by his protection, men of genius and abilities to enrich the ſciences with their learned productions. He employed, moreover, a conſiderable number of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the commentaries, and other compoſitions of the ancients; which extracts were preſerved in certain places for the benefit and ſatisfaction of the curious; and thus, by various exertions of liberality and zeal, this learned prince reſtored the arts and ſciences to a certain degree of life and vigour [*f*]. But few of the Greeks followed this great and illuſtrious example; nor was there any among the ſucceeding emperors who equalled theſe two excellent princes in zeal for the advancement of learning, or in lending, by their protection and encouragement, an auſpicious hand to raiſe out of obſcurity and dejection, neglected and depreſſed genius. But what is ſtill more remarkable, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, whom we have now been repreſenting as the reſtorer of letters, and whom the Greeks unanimouſly admire in this character, is ſuppoſed by ſome to have done conſiderable prejudice to the cauſe of learning by the very means he employed to promote its advancement. For by employing learned men to extract from the writers of antiquity what they thought might contribute to the improvement of the various arts and ſciences, he gave too much occaſion to neglect the ſources, and flattered the indolence of the effeminate Greeks, who confined their ſtudies to theſe extracts, and neglected, in effect, the peruſal of the writers from whom they were drawn. And hence it unfortunately happened, that many of the moſt celebrated authors of antiquity were loſt, at this time, through the ſloth and negligence of the Greeks.

[*c*] See JO. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Græc.* lib. v. part. II. cap. v. p. 363.

[*d*] FABRICIUS, ibid. cap. v. p. 486.

[(*e*) We have yet remaining of CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, ſon of LEO the Philoſopher, the following productions:

The Life of the emperor Baſilius.

A Treatiſe upon the Art of Governing, in which he inveſtigates the origin of ſeveral nations, treats of their power, their progreſs, their revolutions, and their decline, and gives a ſeries of their princes and rulers.

A Diſcourſe concerning the manner of forming a Land Army and a Naval Force in Order of Battle.

Two Books concerning the Eaſtern and Weſtern Provinces.

Which may be conſidered as an account of the ſtate of the empire in the time of this prince.]

Few eminent writers among the Greeks.

II. This method, as the event manifeſtly ſhewed, was really detrimental to the progreſs of true learning and genius. And accordingly we find among the Greek writers of this century but a ſmall number, who acquired a diſtinguiſhed and ſhining reputation in the republic of letters; ſo that the fair and engaging proſpects, which ſeemed to ariſe to the cauſe of learning from the munificence and zeal of its imperial patrons, vaniſhed in a ſhort time; and though the ſeeds of ſcience were richly ſown, the natural expectations of an abundant harveſt were unhappily diſappointed. Nor did the cauſe of philoſophy ſucceed better than that of literature. Philoſophers indeed there were; and, among them, ſome that were not deſtitute of genius and abilities; but none who rendered their names immortal by productions that were worthy of being tranſmitted to poſterity: A certain number of rhetoricians and grammarians: A few poets who were above contempt; and ſeveral hiſtorians, who, without deſerving the higheſt encomiums, were not however totally void of merit. Such were the members which compoſed at this time the republic of letters in *Greece*, whoſe inhabitants ſeemed to take pleaſure in thoſe kinds of literature alone, in which induſtry, imagination, and memory are concerned.

The ſtate of learning among the Saracens.

III. *Egypt*, though at this time it groaned under a heavy and exaſperating yoke of oppreſſion and bondage, produced certain writers, who in genius and learning were no wiſe inferior to the moſt eminent of the Grecian literati. Of the many examples we might mention to prove the truth of this aſſertion, we ſhall confine ourſelves to that of EUTYCHIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, who cultivated the ſciences of phyſic and theology with the greateſt ſucceſs, and caſt a new light upon them both by his excellent writings. The Arabians, during this whole century, preſerved that noble paſſion for the arts and ſciences, which had been kindled among them in the preceding age; and hence they abounded with phyſicians, mathematicians, and philoſophers, whoſe names and characters, together with an account of their reſpective abilities and talents, are given by **Leo Africanus** and other literary hiſtorians.

[*f*] All this appears evident from the accounts left upon record by ZONARAS, in his *Annales*, tom. iii. p. 155. edit. *Pariſ.*

In the weſtern provinces.

IV. The Latins preſent to us a ſpectacle of a very different kind. They were almoſt, without exception, ſunk in the moſt brutiſh and barbarous ignorance; ſo that, according to the unanimous accounts of the moſt credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable, than the darkneſs that reigned in the weſtern world during this century, which, with reſpect to learning and philoſophy at leaſt, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins [g]. Some learned men of modern times have, we confeſs, ventured to call this in queſtion; but their doubts are certainly without foundation, and the matter of fact is too firmly eſtabliſhed by unqueſtionable authorities, to loſe any part of its credit in conſequence of the objections they alledge againſt it [h]. It is true, there were public ſchools founded in moſt of the European provinces, ſome of which were erected in the monaſteries, and the reſt in thoſe cities where the biſhops reſided. It is alſo true, that through this diſmal night of ignorance, there ſhone forth from time to time, and more eſpecially towards the concluſion of this century, ſome geniuſes of a ſuperior order, who eyed with ardour the paths of ſcience, and caſt ſome rays of light upon the darkneſs of a barbarous age. But they were very few in number, and their extreme rarity is a ſufficient proof of the infelicity of the times in which they appeared. In the ſeminaries of learning, ſuch as they were, the ſeven liberal ſciences were taught in the moſt unſkilful and miſerable manner, and that by the monks, who eſteemed the arts and ſciences no farther than as they were ſubſervient to the intereſts of religion, or, to ſpeak more properly, to the views of ſuperſtition.

---

[g] The teſtimonies, that prove the ignorance which prevailed in the xth century, are collected by **Du Boulay**, in his *Hiſtoria Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 288. and alſo by **Lud. Ant. Muratori**, in his *Antiquitat. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 831. et tom. ii. p. 141, &c.

[h] The famous **Leibnitz**, in his *Præfatio ad codicem juris Nat. et Gentium Diplomat.* affirms, that there were more knowledge and learning in the xth century, than in the ſucceeding ages, particularly in the xii and xiiith centuries. But this is waſhing the Ethiopian; it is alſo an extravagant aſſertion, and ſavours much of paradox. We ſhall be better directed in our notions of this matter by **Mabillon**, in his *Præfatio ad Actor. SS. Ordin. Benedict. Quint. Sæc.* p. 2. by the authors of the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, and by **Le Beuf**'s *Diſſertat. de Statu litterarum in Francia, à Carolo M. ad regem Robert.* who all agree in acknowledging the groſs ignorance of this century, though they would engage us to believe that its barbariſm and darkneſs were not ſo hideous as they are commonly repreſented. There are, indeed, ſeveral conſiderations that render the reaſons and teſtimonies, even of theſe writers not a little defective; but we nevertheleſs agree with them ſo far, as to grant that all learning and knowledge were not abſolutely extinguiſhed in Europe at this time, and that, in the records of this century, we ſhall find a few choſen ſpirits, who pierced through the cloud of ignorance that covered the multitude.

Monkiſh learning.

V. They, who were the moſt learned and judicious among the monaſtic orders, and who were deſirous of employing uſefully a part of their leiſure, applied themſelves to the compoſition of annals and hiſtories, which ſavoured of the ignorance and barbariſm of the times. Such were ABO, LUITPRAND, WITTEKIND, FULCUIN, JOHANNES CAPUANUS, RATHERIUS, FLODOARD, NOTKER, ETHELBERT, and others, who, though very different from each other in their reſpective degrees of merit, were all in general ignorant of the true nature and rules of hiſtorical compoſition. Several of the poets of this age gave evident marks of true genius, but they were ſtrangers to the poetic art, which was not indeed neceſſary to ſatisfy a people, utterly deſtitute of elegance and taſte. The grammarians and rhetoricians of theſe unhappy times are ſcarcely worthy of mention; their method of inſtructing was full of abſurdities, and their rules trivial and for the moſt part injudicious. The ſame judgment may be formed in general of the geometry, arithmetic, aſtronomy, and muſic, which were more or leſs taught in the public ſchools, and of which a more particular account would be uninſtructing and inſipid.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

VI. The philoſophy of the Latins extended no farther than the ſingle ſcience of *logic* or *dialectics*, which they looked upon as the ſum and ſubſtance of all human wiſdom. But this logic, which was ſo highly admired, was drawn without the leaſt perſpicuity or method from a book of *Categories*, which ſome have unjuſtly attributed to AUGUSTIN, and others to PORPHYRY. It is true, indeed, that the *Timæus* of PLATO, the *Topica* of CICERO and ARISTOTLE, and the book of the latter, *De interpretatione*, with other compoſitions of the Greeks and Latins, were in the hands of ſeveral of the doctors of this century, as we learn from credible accounts; but the ſame accounts inform us, that the true ſenſe of theſe excellent authors was underſtood by almoſt none of thoſe that peruſed them daily [*i*]. It will appear, no doubt, ſurprizing, that in ſuch an ignorant age, ſuch a ſubtle queſtion as that concerning *univerſal ideas* ſhould ever have been thought of; true however it is, that the famous controverſy, *Whether univerſal ideas belonged to the claſs of objects, or of mere names*; a controverſy which perplexed and bewildered the Latin doctors in ſucceeding times, and gave riſe to the two oppoſite ſects of the *Nominaliſts* and *Realiſts*, was ſtarted for the firſt time in this century. Accordingly we find in ſeveral paſſages of the writers of this period, the ſeeds and beginnings of this tedious and intricate diſpute [*k*].

[*i*] GUNZO *Epiſtol. ad Monachos Augienſes in* MARTENE *Collect. Ampliſſ. Monumentor. Veter.* tom. iii. p. 304.

[*k*] This appears evident from the following remarkable paſſage, which the reader will find at the 304th page of the work cited in the preceding note, and in which the learned GUNZO expreſſes himſelf in the following manner: *Ariſtoteles, genus, ſpeciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens ſubſiſtere denegavit, quæ Platoni ſubſiſtentia perſuaſit. Ariſtoteli an Platoni magis credendum putatis? Magna eſt utriuſque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis alterum alteri dignitate præferre.* Here we ſee plainly the ſeeds of diſcord ſown, and the foundation laid for that knotty diſpute which puzzled the metaphyſical brains of the Latin doctors in after times. GUNZO was not adventurous enough to attempt a ſolution of this intricate queſtion, which he leaves undecided; others were leſs modeſt, without being more ſucceſsful.

The reſtoration of letters in *Europe* by Sylveſter II.

VII. The drooping ſciences found an eminent and illuſtrious patron, towards the concluſion of this century, in the learned Gerbert, a native of *France*, who, upon his elevation to the pontificate, aſſumed the title of Sylvester II. The genius of this famous pontif was extenſive and ſublime, embracing all the different branches of literature; but its more peculiar bent was turned towards mathematical ſtudies. Mechanics, geometry, aſtronomy, arithmetic, and every other kind of knowledge that had the leaſt affinity to theſe important ſciences, were cultivated by this reſtorer of learning with the moſt ardent zeal, and not without ſucceſs, as his writings abundantly teſtify; nor did he ſtop here; but employed every method that was proper to encourage and animate others to the culture of the liberal arts and ſciences. The effects of this noble zeal were viſible in *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*, both in this and in the following century; as by the writings, example, and encouraging exhortations of Gerbert, many were excited to the ſtudy of phyſic, mathematics, and philoſophy, and in general to the purſuit of ſcience in all its various branches. If, indeed, we compare this learned pontif with the mathematicians of modern times, his merit, in that point of view, will almoſt totally diſappear under ſuch a diſadvantageous compariſon; for his *geometry*, though it be eaſy and perſpicuous, is but elementary and ſuperficial [*l*]. Yet ſuch as it was, it was marvellous in an age of barbariſm and darkneſs, and ſurpaſſed the comprehenſion of thoſe pigmy philoſophers, whoſe eyes, under the auſpicious direction of Gerbert, were but juſt beginning to open upon the light. Hence it was, that the geometrical figures, deſcribed by this mathematical pontif, were regarded by the monks as magical operations, and the pontif himſelf was treated as a magician and a diſciple of ſatan [*m*].

Who derived his knowledge and erudition from the Arabians.

VIII. It was not, however, to the fecundity of his genius alone, that Gerbert was indebted for the knowledge with which he now began to enlighten the European provinces; he had derived a part of his erudition, particularly in phyſic, mathematics, and philoſophy, from the writings and inſtructions of the Arabians, who were ſettled in *Spain*. Thither he had repaired in purſuit of knowledge, and had ſpent ſome time in the ſeminaries of learning at *Cordoua* and *Seville*, with a view to hear the Arabian doctors [*n*]; and it was, perhaps, by his example, that the Europeans were directed and engaged to have recourſe to this ſource of inſtruction in after times. For it is undeniably certain, that, from the time of Gerbert, ſuch of the Europeans as were ambitious of making any conſiderable progreſs in phyſic, arithmetic, geometry, or philoſophy, entertained the moſt eager and impatient deſire of receiving inſtruction either from the academical leſſons, or from the writings of the Arabian philoſophers, who had founded ſchools in ſeveral parts of *Spain* and *Italy*. Hence it was, that the moſt celebrated productions of theſe doctors were tranſlated into Latin, their tenets and ſyſtems adopted with zeal in the European ſchools, and that numbers went over to *Spain* and *Italy* to receive inſtruction from the mouths of theſe famous teachers, which were ſuppoſed to utter nothing but the deepeſt myſteries of wiſdom and knowledge. However exceſſive this veneration for the Arabian doctors may have been, it muſt be owned, nevertheleſs, that all the knowledge, whether of phyſic, aſtronomy, philoſophy, or mathematics, which flouriſhed in *Europe* from the x^th century, was originally derived from them; and that the Spaniſh Saracens, in a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the fathers of European philoſophy.

[*l*] This geometry was publiſhed by B. Pezius, in his *Theſaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 7.

[*m*] See *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. vi. p. 558.—Du Boulay, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 314. 319.—Naude, *Apologie pour les Grands hommes fauſſement accuſés de la Magie*, chap. xix. § 4.

[*n*] See Du Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 314.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. TO thoſe who conſider the primitive dignity and the ſolemn nature of the miniſterial character, the corruptions of the clergy muſt appear deplorable beyond all expreſſion. Theſe corruptions were mounted to the moſt enormous height in that diſmal period of the church, which we have now before us. Both in the eaſtern and weſtern provinces, the clergy were, for the moſt part, compoſed of a moſt worthleſs ſet of men, ſhamefully illiterate and ſtupid, ignorant more eſpecially in religious matters, equally enſlaved to ſenſuality and ſuperſtition, and capable of the moſt abominable and flagitious deeds. This diſmal degeneracy of the ſacred order was, according to the moſt credible accounts, principally owing to the pretended chiefs and rulers of the univerſal church, who indulged themſelves in the commiſſion of the moſt odious crimes, and abandoned themſelves to the lawleſs impulſe of the moſt licentious paſſions without reluctance or remorſe, who confounded, in ſhort, all difference between juſt and unjuſt, to ſatisfy their impious ambition, and whoſe ſpiritual empire was ſuch a diverſified ſcene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of thoſe temporal tyrants, who have been the ſcourges of mankind. We may form ſome notion of the Grecian patriarchs from the ſingle example of THEOPHYLACT, who, according to the teſtimonies of the moſt reſpectable writers, made the moſt impious traffic of eccleſiaſtical promotions, and expreſſed no ſort of care about any thing but his dogs and horſes [o]. Degenerate, however, and licentious as theſe

---

[(o) This *exemplary* prelate, who ſold every eccleſiaſtical benefice as ſoon as it became vacant, had in his ſtable above 2000 hunting horſes, which he fed with pignuts, piſtachio's, dates, dried grapes, figs ſteeped in the moſt exquiſite wines, to all which he added the richeſt perfumes. One Holy Thurſday, as he was celebrating high-maſs, his groom brought him the joyful news that one of his favourite mares had foaled; upon which he threw down the Liturgy, left the church, and ran in raptures to the ſtable, where having expreſſed his joy at that *grand* event, he returned to the altar to finiſh the divine ſervice which he had left interrupted during his abſence. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* livre lv. p. 97. edit. *Bruxelle.*]

theſe patriarchs might be, they were, generally ſpeaking, leſs profligate and indecent than the Roman pontifs.

The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs.

II. The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs, that lived in this century, is a hiſtory of ſo many monſters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible ſeries of the moſt flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even thoſe of the Romiſh communion, unanimouſly confeſs. The ſource of theſe diſorders muſt be ſought for principally in the calamities that fell upon the greateſt part of *Europe*, and that afflicted *Italy* in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of Charlemagne. Upon the death of the pontif Benedict IV, which happened in the year 903, Leo V was raiſed to the pontificate, which he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by Christopher, and caſt into priſon. Christopher, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity the year following by Sergius III, a Roman preſbyter, ſeconded by the protection and influence of Adalbert, a moſt powerful Tuſcan prince, who had a ſupreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were tranſacted at *Rome*. Anastasius III and Lando, who, upon the death of Sergius, in the year 911, were raiſed ſucceſſively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a ſhort time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illuſtrious.

John X created Roman pontif.

III. After the death of Lando, which happened in the year 914, Alberic [*p*], marquis or count of *Tuſcany*, whoſe opulence was prodigious, and whoſe authority in *Rome* was deſpotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for John X, archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, in compliance with the ſollicitation of Theodora, his mother-in-law, whoſe lewdneſs was the principle that intereſted her in this promotion [*q*]. This infamous election will not ſurprize ſuch as know that the laws of *Rome* were at this time abſolutely ſilent; that the dictates of juſtice and equity were overpowered and ſuſpended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by intereſt or corruption, by violence or fraud. John X, though in other reſpects a ſcandalous example of iniquity and lewdneſs in the papal chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign againſt the Saracens, whom he drove from the ſettlements they had made upon the banks of the *Garigliano* [*r*]. He did not, however, enjoy his glory long; the enmity of Marozia, daughter of Theodora, and wife of Alberic, proved fatal to him. For this bloody-minded woman having eſpouſed Wido, or Guy, marquis of *Tuſcany*, after the death of her firſt conſort, engaged him to ſeize the wanton pontif, who was her mother's lover, and to put him to death

---

[(*p*) It was Albert or Adalbert, and not Alberic, who was the ſon-in-law of the elder Theodora, of whom Dr. Mosheim here ſpeaks. Alberic was grandſon to this Theodora, by her daughter Marozia, who was married to Albert. See Spanheim, *Eccl. Hiſt. Secul.* x. p. 1432.—Fleury, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livre liv. p. 571. edit. *Bruxelle*.—This latter hiſtorian is of opinion, that it was the younger Theodora, the ſiſter of Maroria, who, from an amorous principle, raiſed John X to the pontificate.]

[(*q*) Theodora, miſtreſs of *Rome*, had John X raiſed to the pontificate, that ſhe might continue that licentious commerce in which ſhe had lived with that carnal eccleſiaſtic for many years paſt. See Fleury, and other writers, *&c.*]

[(*r*) In the original we have *Montem Garilianum*, which is, undoubtedly, a miſtake, as the *Garigliano* is a river in the kingdom of *Naples*, and not a mountain.]

in the priſon where he lay confined. This licentious and unlucky pontif was ſucceeded by LEO VI, who ſat but ſeven months in the apoſtolic chair, which was filled after him by STEPHEN VII. The death of this latter, which happened in the year 931, preſented to the ambition of MAROZIA, an object worthy of its graſp; and accordingly ſhe raiſed to the papal dignity JOHN XI, who was the fruit of her lawleſs amours with one of the pretended ſucceſſors of St. PETER, SERGIUS III, whoſe adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Roman church [s].

John XI and XII.

IV. JOHN XI, who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was pulled down from this ſummit of ſpiritual grandeur A. D. 933, by ALBERIC his half-brother, who had conceived the utmoſt averſion againſt him. His mother MAROZIA had, after the death of WIDO, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with HUGO, king of *Italy*, who, having offended his ſtep-ſon ALBERIC, felt ſeverely the weight of his reſentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for ALBERIC drove out of *Rome* not only HUGO, but alſo MAROZIA and her ſon the pontif, and confined them in priſon, where the latter ended his days in the year 936. The four pontifs, who, in their turns, ſucceeded JOHN XI, and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were LEO VII, STEPHEN VIII, MARINUS II, and AGAPET, whoſe characters were much better than that of their predeceſſor, and whoſe government, at leaſt, was not attended with thoſe tumults and revolutions, that had ſo often ſhook the pontifical throne, and baniſhed from *Rome* the ineſtimable bleſſings of peace and concord. Upon the death of AGAPET, which happened in the year 956, ALBERIC II, who to the dignity of Roman conſul joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could reſiſt, raiſed to the pontificate his ſon OCTAVIAN, who was yet in the early bloom of youth, and deſtitute, beſides, of every quality that was requiſite in order to diſcharge the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontif aſſumed the name of JOHN XII, and thus introduced the cuſtom, that has ſince been adopted by all his ſucceſſors in the ſee of *Rome*, of changing each their uſual name for another upon their acceſſion to the pontificate.

The fate of John XII.

V. The fate of JOHN XII was as unhappy as his promotion had been ſcandalous. Unable to bear the oppreſſive yoke of BERENGER II, king of *Italy*, he ſent ambaſſadors, in the year 960, to OTHO the Great, entreating him to march into *Italy* at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To theſe entreaties the perplexed pontif added a ſolemn promiſe, that, if the

---

[s] The character and conduct of MAROZIA are acknowledged to have been moſt infamous by the unanimous teſtimony both of ancient and modern hiſtorians, who affirm, with one voice, that JOHN XI was the fruit of her carnal commerce with SERGIUS III. ECCARD, alone, in his *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. ii. p 131. has ventured to clear her from this reproach, and to aſſert that SERGIUS, before his elevation to the pontificate, was her lawful, and firſt huſband. The attempt, however, is highly extravagant, if not impudent, to pretend to acquit without the leaſt teſtimony or proof of her innocence, a woman who is known to have been entirely deſtitute of every principle of virtue.

German monarch came to his aſſiſtance, he would array him with the purple and the other enſigns of ſovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. Otho received this embaſſy with pleaſure, marched into *Italy* at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly ſaluted by John with the title of emperor of the Romans. The pontif, however, ſoon perceiving that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the ſtep he had taken, and, though he had ſworn allegiance to the emperor as his lawful ſovereign, and that in the moſt ſolemn manner, yet he broke his oath, and joined with Adalbert, the ſon of Berenger, againſt Otho. This revolt was not left unpuniſhed. The emperor returned to *Rome* in the year 964, called a council, before which he accuſed and convicted the pontif of many crimes; and, after having degraded him in the moſt ignominious manner, from his high office, he appointed Leo VIII to fill his place. Upon Otho's departure from *Rome*, John returned to that city, and in a council, which he aſſembled in the year 964, condemned the pontif whom the emperor had elected, and ſoon after died in a miſerable and violent manner. After his death the Romans choſe Benedict V, biſhop of *Rome*, in oppoſition to Leo; but the emperor annulled this election, reſtored Leo to the papal chair, and carried Benedict to *Hamburg*, where he died in exile [*t*].

**John XIII.
Benedict VII.**

VI. The pontifs who governed the ſee of *Rome* from Leo VIII, who died A. D. 965, to Gerbert or Silveſter II, who was raiſed to the pontificate towards the concluſion of this century, were more happy in their adminſtration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predeceſſors; yet none of them ſo exemplary as to deſerve the applauſe that is due to eminent virtue. John XIII, who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 965, by the authority of Otho the Great, was driven out of *Rome* in the beginning of his adminiſtration; but, the year following, upon the emperor's return to *Italy*, he was reſtored to his high dignity in the calm poſſeſſion of which he ended his days A. D. 972. His ſucceſſor Benedict VI was not ſo happy; caſt into priſon by Crescentius, ſon of the famous Theodora, in conſequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both againſt his perſon and government, he was loaded with all ſorts of ignominy, and was ſtrangled in the year 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him Otho the Great, whoſe power and ſeverity kept the Romans in awe, died in the year 973, and with him expired that order and diſcipline which he had reſtored in *Rome* by ſalutary laws executed with impartiality and vigour. The face of things was entirely changed by that event; licentiouſneſs and diſorder, ſeditions and aſſaſſinations, reſumed their former ſway, and diffuſed their horrors through that miſerable city. After the death of BENEDICT, the papal chair was filled by FRANCO, who aſſumed the name of BONIFACE VII, but enjoyed his dignity only for a ſhort time; for ſcarcely a month had paſſed after his promotion when he was depoſed from his office, expelled the city, and ſucceeded by DONUS II [u], who is known by no other circumſtance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in the year 975, BENEDICT VII was created pontif; and, during the ſpace of nine years, ruled the church without much oppoſition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happineſs was, without doubt, principally owing to the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged; for he was nearly related to the famous ALBERIC, whoſe power, or rather deſpotiſm, had been unlimited in *Rome*.

[*t*] In the account I have here given of the pontifs of this century I have conſulted the ſources, which are to be found, for the moſt part, in Muratori's *Scriptores Rerum Italicar.* as alſo Baronius, Peter de Marca, Sigonius *De Regno Italiæ*, with the learned annotations of Ant. Saxius, Muratori, in his *Annales Italiæ*, Pagi, and other writers, all of whom have had acceſs to the ſources, and to ſeveral ancient manuſcripts, which have not as yet been publiſhed. The narrations, I have here given, are moſt certainly true upon the whole. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that many parts of the papal hiſtory lie yet in great obſcurity, and ſtand much in need of farther illuſtration; nor will I deny that a ſpirit of partiality has been extremely detrimental to the hiſtory of the pontifs by corrupting it, and rendering it uncertain in a multitude of places.

John XIV and XV.

VII. His ſucceſſor JOHN XIV, who, from the biſhopric of *Pavia* was raiſed to the pontificate, derived no ſupport from his birth, which was obſcure, nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of OTHO III, to whom he owed his promotion. Hence the calamities that fell upon him with ſuch fury, and the miſery that concluded his tranſitory grandeur; for BONIFACE VII, who had uſurped the papal throne in the year 974, and in a little time after had been baniſhed *Rome*, returned from *Conſtantinople*, whither he had fled for refuge, and ſeizing the unhappy pontif, had him thrown into priſon, and afterwards put to death. Thus BONIFACE reſumed the government of the church; but his reign was alſo tranſitory, for he died about ſix months after his reſtoration [w]. He was ſucceeded by JOHN XV, whom ſome writers call JOHN XVI, becauſe as they alledge, there was another JOHN, who ruled the church during the ſpace of four months, and whom they conſequently call JOHN XV [x]. Leaving it to the reader's choice to call that JOHN of whom we ſpeak, the XV, or the XVI, of that name, we ſhall only obſerve that he poſſeſſed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996, that his adminiſtration was as happy as the troubled ſtate of the Roman affairs would permit, and that the tranquillity he enjoyed was not ſo much owing to his wiſdom and prudence, as to his being a Roman by birth, and to his deſcent from noble and illuſtrious anceſtors. Certain it is, at leaſt, that his ſucceſſor GREGORY V, who was a German, and who was elected pontif by the order of OTHO III, A. D. 996, met with a quite different treatment; for CRESCENS, the Roman conſul, drove him out of the city, and conferred his dignity upon JOHN XVI, formerly known by the name of PHILAGATHUS. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects, for OTHO III, alarmed by theſe diſturbances at *Rome*, marched

---

[(u) Some writers place DONUS II before BENEDICT VI. See the *Tabulæ Synopticæ Hiſt. Eccl.* of the learned PFAFF.]

[(w) FLEURY ſays eleven months.]

[(x) Among theſe writers is the learned PFAFF, in his *Tabulæ Synopticæ*, &c. But the Roman catholic writers, whom Dr. MOSHEIM follows with good reaſon, don't count among the number of the pontifs that JOHN who governed the church of *Rome* during the ſpace of four months, after the death of BONIFACE VII, becauſe he was never duly inveſted, by conſecration, with the papal dignity.]

into *Italy*, A. D. 998, at the head of a powerful army, and caſting into priſon the new pontif, whom the ſoldiers, in the firſt moments of their fury, had maimed, and abuſed in a moſt barbarous manner, he reinſtated GREGORY in his former honours, and placed him anew at the head of the church. It was upon the death of this latter pontif, which happened ſoon after his reſtoration, that the ſame emperor raiſed to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend the famous and learned GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II, whoſe promotion was attended with the univerſal approbation of the Roman people [*y*].

The influence and authority of the pontifs increaſes daily,

VIII. Amidſt theſe frequent commotions, and even amidſt the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of thoſe who gave themſelves out for CHRIST's vice-gerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontifs increaſed imperceptibly from day to day; ſuch were the effects of that ignorance and ſuperſtition that reigned without controul in theſe miſerable times. OTHO the Great had indeed publiſhed a ſolemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontif without the previous knowledge and conſent of the emperor; which edict, as all writers unanimouſly agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the concluſion of this century. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the ſame emperor, as likewiſe his ſon and grandſon, who ſucceeded him in the empire, maintained, without interruption, their right of ſupremacy over the city of *Rome*, its territory, and its pontif, as may be demonſtrably proved from a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain, that the German, French, and Italian biſhops, who were not ignorant of the nature of their privileges, and the extent of their juriſdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard againſt every attempt, the Roman pontif might make, to aſſume to himſelf *alone* a legiſlative authority in the church. But, notwithſtanding all this, the biſhops of *Rome* found means of augmenting their influence, and partly by open violence, partly by ſecret and fraudulent ſtratagems, encroached not only upon the privileges of the biſhops, but alſo upon the juriſdiction and rights of kings and emperors [*z*]. Their ambitious attempts were ſeconded and juſtified by the ſcandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of what they called the apoſtolic ſee in the moſt pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have obſerved, that in this century certain biſhops maintained publicly that the Roman pontifs were not only biſhops of *Rome*, but of the whole world, an aſſertion which hitherto none had ventured to make [*a*], and that even among the French clergy, it had been affirmed by ſome, that *the authority of the biſhops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St.* PETER, *the prince of the apoſtles* [b].

[*y*] The hiſtory of the Roman pontifs of this period is not only extremely barren of intereſting events, but alſo obſcure, and uncertain in many reſpects. In the accounts I have here given of them, I have followed principally LUD. ANT. MURATORI's *Annales Italiæ*, and the *Conatus Chronologico-Hiſtoricus de Romanis Pontificibus*, which the learned PAPEBROCHIUS has prefixed to his *Acta Sanctorum Menſis Maii.*

[*z*] Several examples of theſe uſurpations may be found in the *Hiſtoire du droit Eccleſ. François*, tom. i. p. 217. edit. in 8^{vo}.

[*a*] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 98.

The biſhops and abbots enlarge alſo their juriſdiction and prerogatives.

IX. The adventurous ambition of the biſhops of *Rome*, who left no means unemployed to extend their juriſdiction, exhibited an example which the inferior prelates followed with the moſt zealous and indefatigable emulation. Several biſhops and abbots had begun even from the time that the deſcendants of CHARLEMAGNE ſat on the imperial throne, to enlarge their prerogatives, and had actually obtained, for their tenants and their poſſeſſions, an immunity from the juriſdiction of the counts and other magiſtrates, as alſo from taxes and impoſts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretenſions ſtill farther; aimed at the civil juriſdiction over the cities and territories in which they exerciſed a ſpiritual dominion, and aſpired after nothing leſs than the honours and authority of dukes, marquiſes, and counts of the empire. Among the principal circumſtances that animated their zeal in the purſuit of theſe dignities, we may reckon the perpetual and bitter conteſts concerning juriſdiction and other matters, that reigned between the dukes and counts, who were governors of cities, and the biſhops and abbots, who were their ghoſtly rulers. The latter therefore, ſeizing the favourable opportunity that was offered them by the ſuperſtition of the times, uſed every method that might be effectual to obtain that high rank, that hitherto ſtood in the way of their ambition. And the emperors and kings to whom they addreſſed their preſumptuous requeſts generally granted them, either from a deſire of pacifying the contentions and quarrels that aroſe between civil and military magiſtrates, or from a devout reverence for the ſacred order, or with a view to augment their own authority, and to confirm their dominion by the good ſervices of the biſhops, whoſe influence was very great upon the minds of the people. Such were the different motives that engaged different princes to enlarge the authority and juriſdiction of the clergy; and hence we ſee from this century downwards ſo many biſhops and abbots inveſted with characters, employments, and titles ſo foreign to their ſpiritual offices and functions, and cloathed with the honours of dukes, marquiſes, counts, and viſcounts [c].

Simony and *concubinage*, the principal vices of the clergy.

X. Beſides the reproach of the groſſeſt ignorance which the Latin clergy in this century ſo juſtly deſerve [d], they were alſo chargeable, in a very heinous degree, with two other odious and enormous vices, even *concubinage* and *ſimony*, which the greateſt part of the writers of theſe unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the firſt of theſe vices it was practiſed too openly to admit of any doubt. The prieſts, and, what is ſtill more ſurprizing, even the ſanctimonious monks fell victims to the triumphant charms of the ſex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal luſts, and entering into the bonds of wedlock or concubinage, ſquandered away in a moſt luxurious manner, with their wives or miſtreſſes, the revenues of the church [*e*]. The other vice above-mentioned reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiouſneſs. The election of biſhops and abbots was no longer made according to the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or their miniſters and favorites, either conferred theſe eccleſiaſtical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or ſold them, without ſhame, to the higheſt bidder [*f*]. Hence it happened, that the moſt ſtupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the moſt important ſtations in the church, and that, upon ſeveral occaſions, even ſoldiers, civil magiſtrates, counts, and ſuch like perſons, were, by a ſtrange metamorphoſis, converted into biſhops, and abbots. Gregory VII endeavoured, in the following century, to put a ſtop to theſe two growing evils.

---

[b] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 186.

[c] The learned LOUIS THOMASSIN, in his *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ veteri et nova*, tom. iii. lib. i. cap. xxviii. p. 89. has collected a multitude of examples to prove that the titles and prerogatives of dukes and counts were conferred upon certain prelates ſo early as the IXth century: nay, ſome biſhops trace even to the VIIIth century the riſe and firſt beginnings of that princely dominion which they now enjoy. But notwithſtanding all this, if I be not entirely and groſsly miſtaken, there cannot be produced any evident and indiſputable example of this princely dominion, previous to the Xth century.

[d] RATHERIUS, ſpeaking of the clergy of *Verona* in his *Itinerarium*, which is publiſhed in the *Spicilegium* of DACHERIUS, tom. i. p. 381. ſays, that he found many among them who could not even repeat the Apoſtles Creed. His words are: *Sciſcitatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipſum ſapere Symbolum, qui fuiſſe creditur Apoſtolorum.*

The monkiſh diſcipline declines to nothing.

XI. While the monaſtic orders, among the Greeks, and Orientals, maintained ſtill an external appearance of religion and decency, the Latin monks, towards the commencement of this century, had ſo entirely loſt ſight of all ſubordination and diſcipline, that the greateſt part of them knew not even by name the rule of St. Benedict, which they were obliged to obſerve. A noble Frank, whoſe name was Odo, a man as learned and pious as the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the times would permit, endeavoured to remedy this diſorder, nor were his attempts totally unſucceſsful. This zealous eccleſiaſtic being created, in the year 927, abbot of *Clugni*, in the province of *Burgundy*, upon the death of Berno, not only obliged the monks to live in a vigorous obſervance of their rules, but alſo added to their diſcipline a new ſet of rites and ceremonies, which, notwithſtanding the air of ſanctity that attended them, were, in reality, inſignificant and trifling, and yet at the ſame time ſevere and burthenſome [*g*]. This new rule of diſcipline covered its author with glory, and, in a ſhort time, was adopted in all the European conventſ; for the greateſt part of the ancient monaſteries, which had been founded in *France*, *Germany*, *Italy*, *Britain*, and *Spain*, received the rule of the monks of *Clugni*, to which alſo the convents, newly eſtabliſhed, were ſubjected by their founders. And thus it was, that the *Order of Clugni* arrived to that high degree of eminence and authority, opulence and dignity, which it exhibited to the Chriſtian world in the following century [*b*].

[*e*] That this cuſtom was introduced towards the commencement of this century is manifeſt, from the teſtimony of Ordericus Vitalis and other writers, and alſo from a letter of Mantio, biſhop of *Chalons* in *Champagne*, which is publiſhed by Mabillon, in his *Analecta veterum*, p. 429. edit. nov. As to the charge brought againſt the Italian monks of their ſpending the treaſures of the church upon their wives or miſtreſſes, ſee Hugo, *De Monaſterii Farfenſis deſtructione*, which is publiſhed in Muratori's *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 278.

[*f*] Many infamous and ſtriking examples and proofs of this ſimoniacal practice may be found in the work entitled *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 23. 37. tom. ii p. 173. 179. Add to this Abbonis *Apologeticum*, which is publiſhed at the end of the *Codex Canon. Pithoei*, p. 398. as alſo Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v.

[*g*] See Mabillon, *Annal. Benedictini*, tom. iii. p. 386. and *Præf. ad Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* v. p. xxvi. See alſo the *Acta Sanctor. Bened. Sæc.* v. p. 66. in which he ſpeaks largely concerning Berno, the firſt abbot of *Clugni*, who laid the foundations of that order, and of Odo (p. 122.) who gave it a new degree of perfection. The learned Helyot, in his *Hiſtoire des Ordres Religieuſes*, tom. v. p. 184. has given a complete and elegant hiſtory of the order of *Clugni*, and the preſent ſtate of that famous monaſtery is deſcribed by Martene, in his *Voyage Litter. de deux Benedict.* part. I. p. 227.

Greek writers.

XII. The more eminent Greek writers of this century are eaſily numbered; among them was SIMEON, high treaſurer of *Conſtantinople*, who, from his giving a new and more elegant ſtyle to the *Lives of the Saints*, which had been originally compoſed in a groſs and barbarous language, was diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Metaphraſt*, or *Tranſlator* [*i*]. He did not, however, content himſelf with digeſting, poliſhing, and embelliſhing the ſaintly chronicle, but went ſo far as to augment it with a multitude of trifling fables drawn from the fecundity of his own imagination.

NICON, an Armenian monk, compoſed a treatiſe, *Concerning the Religion of the Armenians*, which is not altogether contemptible.

Some place in this century OLYMPIODORUS [*k*] and OECUMENIUS, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by thoſe compilations which were known by the name of *Catenæ*, or *Chains*, and of which we have had occaſion to ſpeak more than once in the courſe of this hiſtory. But it is by no means certain, that theſe two writers belong to the x^th^ century, and they are placed there only by conjecture.

It is much more probable, that the learned SUIDAS, author of the celebrated *Greek Lexicon*, lived in the period now before us.

Among the Arabians no author acquired a higher reputation than EUTYCHIUS, biſhop of *Alexandria*, whoſe *Annals*, with ſeveral other productions of his learned pen, are ſtill extant [*l*].

Latin writers.

XIII. The moſt eminent of the Latin writers of this century was GERBERT, or SYLVESTER II, who has already been mentioned with the applauſe due to his ſingular merit. The other writers of this age were far from being eminent in any reſpect.

[*b*] If we are not miſtaken, the greateſt part of eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians have not perceived the true meaning and force of the word *order* in its application to the *Ciſtertian* monks, thoſe of *Clugni*, and other convents. They imagine that this term ſignifies a new monaſtic inſtitution, as if the *Order of Clugni* was a new ſect of monks never before heard of. But this is a great error into which they fall by confounding the ancient meaning of that term with the ſenſe in which it is uſed in modern times. The word *order*, when employed by the writers of the x^th^ century, ſignified no more at firſt than a certain form or rule of monaſtic diſcipline; but from this primitive ſignification, another, and a ſecondary one was gradually derived. So that by the word *order* is alſo underſtood, an aſſociation or confederacy of ſeveral monaſteries, ſubjected to the ſame rule of diſcipline under the juriſdiction and inſpection of one common chief. Hence we conclude, that the *Order of Clugni* was not a new ſect of monks, ſuch as were the *Carthuſian*, *Dominican*, and *Franciſcan Orders*; but ſignified only, *firſt*, that new inſtitution or rule of diſcipline, which ODO had preſcribed to the Benedictine monks, who were ſettled at *Clugni*, and, *afterwards*, that prodigious multitude of monaſteries throughout *Europe*, which received the rule eſtabliſhed at *Clugni*, and were formed by aſſociation into a ſort of community, of which the abbot of *Clugni* was the chief.

[*i*] See LEO ALLATIUS, *De Symeonum Scriptis*, p. 24.—JO. BOLLANDUS, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Antwerp.* § iii. p. 6.

[*k*] For an account of OECUMENIUS, ſee MONTFAUCON *Biblioth. Coiſliniana*, p. 274.

[*l*] See JO. ALBERT. FABRICII *Bibliographia Antiquaria*, p. 179.—As alſo EUSEBII RENAUDOTI *Hiſtoria Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 347.

ODO, who laid the foundations of the celebrated *Order of Clugni*, left behind him ſeveral productions in which the groſſeſt ſuperſtition reigns, and in which it is difficult to perceive the ſmalleſt marks of true genius or ſolid judgment [m].

The learned reader will form a different opinion of RATHEIR, biſhop of *Verona*, whoſe works, yet extant, give evident proofs of ſagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue [n.]

ATTO, biſhop of *Vercelli*, compoſed a treatiſe, *De preſſuris Eccleſiaſticis*, i. e. *Concerning the Sufferings and Grievances of the Church*, which ſhews in their true colours the ſpirit and complexion of the times [o].

DUNSTAN, the famous abbot of *Glaſſenbury*, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, compoſed in favour of the monks a book, *De Concordia Regularum*, i. e. *Concerning the Harmony of the Monaſtic Rules* [p].

ELFRIC, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, acquired a conſiderable reputation among the Anglo-Saxons eſtabliſhed in *Britain*, by various productions [q].

BURCHARD, biſhop of *Worms*, is highly eſteemed among the Canoniſts on account of his celebrated *Decreta*, which he has divided into xx books; though a part of the merit of this collection of *Canons* is due to OLBERT, with whoſe aſſiſtance it was compoſed [r].

ODILO, archbiſhop of *Lions* [s], was the author of ſome inſipid diſcourſes, and other productions, whoſe mediocrity has almoſt ſunk them in a total oblivion.

As to the hiſtorical writers and annaliſts who lived in this century, their works and abilities have been already conſidered in their proper place.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church in this century.

The ſtate of religion,

I. THE ſtate of religion in this century was ſuch as might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The moſt important doctrines of Chriſtianity were diſfigured and perverted in the moſt wretched manner, and ſuch as had preſerved, in unſkilful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheleſs obſcured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, ſo that their intrinſic excellence and luſtre were little attended to; all this will appear evident to thoſe who look with the ſmalleſt degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the eſſence and life of religion in the worſhip of images, and departed ſaints, in ſearching after with zeal, and preſerving with a devout care and veneration, the ſacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the prieſts and monks, whoſe opulence increaſed with the progreſs of ſuperſtition. Scarcely did any Chriſtian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering firſt the ſaints and images propitious by a ſolemn round of expiatory rites and luſtrations. The ardour alſo with which relics were ſought ſurpaſſes almoſt all credibility; it had ſeized all ranks and orders among the people, and was grown into a ſort of fanaticiſm and frenzy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the ſupreme Being interpoſed, in an eſpecial and extraordinary manner, to diſcover to doating old-wives and bare-headed friars the places where the bones or carcaſes of the ſaints lay diſperſed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire that was to deſtroy the remaining impurities of departed ſouls, were now carried to the greateſt height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehenſions of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter eaſily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the ſaints; while from the pains of purgatory they knew there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding theſe ſuperſtitious terrors admirably adapted to encreaſe their authority and to promote their intereſt, uſed every method to augment them, and by the moſt pathetic diſcourſes, accompanied with monſtrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to eſtabliſh the doctrine of purgatory, and alſo to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.

---

[m] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 229.

[n] Id. Ibid. p. 339.

[o] Id. Ibid. p. 281.

[(p) See the ample account that is given of this eminent prelate in COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 181. 183, 184, 185. 197. 203.]

[(q) We have a *Grammar* and a *Dictionary* compoſed by this learned prelate; as alſo an Anglo-Saxon tranſlation of the *Firſt Books of the Holy Scripture*, *A Hiſtory of the Church*, and 180 *Sermons*. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccl.* livre lviii. p. 384. edit. *de Bruxelles*.]

[r] See the *Chronicon Wormatienſe* in LUDWIG's *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptorum*, tom. ii. p. 43.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 295.

[(s) ODILO was abbot of *Cluni*, and not archbiſhop of *Lions*, which latter eminent ſtation he obſtinately refuſed, notwithſtanding the urgent entreaties employed both by pontifs and emperors to engage him to accept it. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccl.* livre lix. p. 520. edit. *de Bruxelles*.]

The diſputes concerning predeſtination and the Lord's ſupper.

II. The conteſts concerning predeſtination, and grace, as alſo concerning the euchariſt, that had agitated the church in the preceding century, were in this happily reduced to ſilence. This was owing to the mutual toleration that was practiſed by the contending parties, who, as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain, or to change, their former opinions. Beſides, the ignorance and ſtupidity of this degenerate age were ill ſuited to ſuch deep inquiries as theſe conteſts demanded; nor was there almoſt any curioſity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning theſe and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of AUGUSTIN and PELAGIUS flouriſhed equally in this century, and that, if there were many who maintained the corporal preſence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the holy ſacrament, there were ſtill more, who were either come to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publicly as their opinion, that the divine Saviour was really abſent from the euchariſtical ſacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulſe of faith, and that in a manner wholly ſpiritual [*t*]. This mutual toleration, as it is eaſy to conclude from what has been already obſerved, muſt not be attributed either to the wiſdom or virtue of an age, which was almoſt totally deſtitute of both. The truth of the matter is that the divines of this century wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack or defend any doctrine, whoſe refutation or defence required the ſmalleſt portion of learning or logic.

Superſtition nouriſhed by a multitude of vain and idle opinions.

III. That the whole Chriſtian world was covered, at this time, with a thick and gloomy veil of ſuperſtition, is evident from a prodigious number of teſtimonies and examples which it is needleſs to mention. This horrible cloud, which hid almoſt every ray of truth from the eyes of the multitude, furniſhed a favorable opportunity to the prieſts and monks of propagating many abſurd and ridiculous opinions, which contributed not a little to confirm their credit. Among theſe opinions, which diſhonoured ſo frequently the Latin church, and produced from time to time ſuch violent agitations, none occaſioned ſuch a univerſal pannic, nor ſuch dreadful impreſſions of terror or diſmay, as a notion that now prevailed of the immediate approach of the day of judgment. This notion, which took its riſe from a remarkable paſſage in the *Revelations of St.* JOHN [*u*], and had been entertained by ſome doctors in the preceding century, was advanced publicly by many at this time, and ſpreading itſelf with an amazing rapidity through the European provinces, it threw them into the deepeſt conſternation and anguiſh. For they imagined that St. JOHN had clearly foretold that after a thouſand years from the birth of CHRIST, SATAN was to be let looſe from his priſon, ANTICHRIST to come and the deſtruction and conflagration of the world to follow theſe great and terrible events. Hence prodigious numbers of people, abandoning all their civil connexions and their parental relations, and giving over to the churches or monaſteries all their lands, treaſures, and worldly effects, repaired, with the utmoſt precipitation, to *Paleſtine*, where they imagined that CHRIST would deſcend from heaven to judge the world. Others devoted themſelves by a ſolemn and voluntary oath to the ſervice of the churches, convents, and prieſthood, whoſe ſlaves they became, in the moſt rigorous ſenſe of that word, performing daily their heavy taſks; and all this from a notion, that the ſupreme judge would diminiſh the ſeverity of their ſentence, and look upon them with a more favorable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themſelves the ſlaves of his miniſters. When an eclipſe of the ſun or moon happened to be viſible, the cities were deſerted, and their miſerable inhabitants fled for refuge to hollow caverns, and hid themſelves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending ſummits of ſteep mountains. The opulent attempted to bribe the deity and the ſaintly tribe by rich donations conferred upon the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders, who were looked upon as the immediate vice-gerents of heaven. In many places temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were ſuffered to decay, nay, were deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any uſe ſince the final diſſolution of all things was at hand. In a word, no language is ſufficient to expreſs the confuſion and deſpair that tormented the minds of miſerable mortals upon this occaſion. This general deluſion was, indeed, oppoſed and combated by the diſcerning few, who endeavoured to diſpel theſe groundleſs terrors, and to efface the notion, from which they aroſe, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehenſions of the ſuperſtitious multitude be entirely removed before the concluſion of this century. Then, when they ſaw that the ſo much dreaded period had paſſed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to underſtand that St. JOHN had not really foretold, what they ſo much feared [w].

[*t*] It is certain, that the Latin doctors of this century differed much in their ſentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of CHRIST were preſent in the euchariſt; this is granted by ſuch of the Roman catholic writers as have been ingenuous enough to ſacrifice the ſpirit of party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the Engliſh in this century, has been abundantly proved from the public *Homilies* by RAPIN DE THOYRAS, in his *Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p. 463. It is, however, to be confeſſed, on the other hand, that this abſurd doctrine was already adopted by ſeveral French and German divines. [For a judicious account of the opinions of the Saxon Engliſh church concerning the euchariſt, ſee COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great-Britain*, vol. i. cent. x. p. 204. 266.]

[(*u*) The paſſage here referred to is in the xxth chapter of the *Book of Revelations*, at the 2, 3, and 4th verſes, "And he laid hold of the dragon, that old ſerpent, which is the devil and ſatan, "and bound him *a thouſand years*;—and caſt him into the bottomleſs pit, and ſhut him up, and ſet "a ſeal upon him, that he ſhould deceive the nations no more, till the thouſand years ſhould be fulfilled; and after that he muſt be looſed a little ſeaſon.—And I ſaw thrones, and they ſat upon "them, and judgment was given unto them: and I ſaw the ſouls of them that were beheaded for "the witneſs of Jeſus, and for the word of God, and which had not worſhiped the beaſt, neither his "image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and "reigned with Chriſt a thouſand years."]

The ſaints multiplied.

IV. The number of the ſaints, who were looked upon as miniſters of the kingdom of heaven, and whoſe patronage was eſteemed ſuch an unſpeakable bleſſing, was now multiplied every where, and the celeſtial courts were filled with new legions of this ſpecies of beings, ſome of which, as we have had formerly occaſion to obſerve, had no exiſtence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worſhipers. This multiplication of ſaints may be eaſily accounted for, when we conſider that ſuperſtition, the ſource of fear, was grown to ſuch an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons neceſſary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Beſides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid ſway, and the licentiouſneſs and diſſolution that had ſo generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of ſanctity very eaſy to be acquired; for amidſt ſuch a perverſe generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be eſteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increaſe conſiderably the number of the celeſtial advocates. All thoſe, to whom nature had given an auſtere complexion, a gloomy temper, or an enthuſiaſtic imagination, were, in conſequence of an advantageous compariſon with the profligate multitude, revered as the favorites of heaven, and as the friends of God.

---

[w] Almoſt all the donations that were made to the church during this century, carry evident marks of this groundleſs panic that had ſeized all the European nations, as the reaſons of theſe donations are generally expreſſed in the following words: *Appropinquante mundi termino*, &c. i. e. *The end of the world being now at hand*, &c. Among the many undeniable teſtimonies that we have from ancient records of this univerſal deluſion, that was ſo profitable to the ſacerdotal order, we ſhall confine ourſelves to the quotation of one very remarkable paſſage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, abbot of *Fleury*, *adverſus Arnulphum*, i. e. Arnoul biſhop of *Orleans*, which apology is publiſhed by the learned FRANCIS PITHOU, in the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Romanæ*, p. 401. The words of ABBO are as follow: *De fine quoque mundi coram populo ſermonem in Eccleſia Pariſiorum Adoleſcentulus audivi, quod ſtatim finito mille annorum numero Antichriſtus adveniret, et non longo poſt tempore univerſale judicium ſuccederet: cui prædicationi ex Evangeliis, ac Apocalypſi, et libro Danielis quâ potui virtute reſtiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi inolevit, Abbas meus beatæ memoriæ Richardus, ſagaci animo propulit, poſtquam litteras à Lotharienſibus accepit, quibus me reſpondere juſſit. Nam fama pœne totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annunciatio Dominica in Paraſceve contigiſſet, abſque ullo ſcrupulo finis ſæculi eſſet.*

The Roman pontif, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating ſaints by his ſole authority, gave, in this century, the firſt ſpecimen of this ghoſtly power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exerciſed this privilege alone. This ſpecimen was given in the year 993, by John XV, who, with all the formalities of a ſolemn canonization, enrolled Udalric, biſhop of *Augſburg*, in the number of the ſaints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worſhip and veneration of Chriſtians [*x*]. We muſt not, however, conclude from hence, that after this period the privilege of canonizing new ſaints was veſted ſolely in the Roman pontifs [*y*]; for there are ſeveral examples upon record which prove, that not only provincial councils, but alſo ſeveral of the firſt order among the biſhops, advanced to the rank of ſaints, ſuch as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celeſtial patrons of the church, without ever conſulting the Roman pontif, until the xiith century [*z*]. Then Alexander III abrogated this privilege of the biſhops and councils, and placed *canoziation* in the number of the more important acts of authority [*a*], which the ſovereign pontif alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exerciſe.

The merit of the commentators of this century conſidered.

V. The expoſitors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illuſtrate and explain the ſacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unſucceſsful in their undertakings to deſerve almoſt any notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of Olympiodorus and Oecumenius are to be conſidered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins Remi, or Remigius, biſhop of *Auxerre*, continued the expoſition of the holy ſcriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various reſpects; for he takes very little pains in explaining the literal ſenſe of the words, and employs the whole force of his fantaſtic genius in unfolding their pretended myſtical ſignification, which he looked upon as infinitely more intereſting than their plain and literal meaning. Beſides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally ſpeaking, mere compilations from ancient commoſt rigorous ſenſe of that word, performing daily their heavy taſks; and all this from a notion, that the ſupreme judge would diminiſh the ſeverity of their ſentence, and look upon them with a more favorable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themſelves the ſlaves of his miniſters. When an eclipſe of the ſun or moon happened to be viſible, the cities were deſerted, and their miſerable inhabitants fled for refuge to hollow caverns, and hid themſelves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending ſummits of ſteep mountains. The opulent attempted to bribe the deity and the ſaintly tribe by rich donations conferred upon the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders, who were looked upon as the immediate vice-gerents of heaven. In many places temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were ſuffered to decay, nay, were deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any uſe ſince the final diſſolution of all things was at hand. In a word, no language is ſufficient to expreſs the confuſion and deſpair that tormented the minds of miſerable mortals upon this occaſion. This general deluſion was, indeed, oppoſed and combated by the diſcerning few, who endeavoured to diſpel theſe groundleſs terrors, and to efface the notion, from which they aroſe, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehenſions of the ſuperſtitious multitude be entirely removed before the concluſion of this century. Then, when they ſaw that the ſo much dreaded period had paſſed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to underſtand that St. JOHN had not really foretold, what they ſo much feared [*w*].

[*x*] Franc. Pagi *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 259.

[*y*] This abſurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by Phil. Bonnanus, in his *Numiſmata Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. i. p. 41.

[*z*] See Franc. Pagi *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 260. tom. iii. p. 30.—Arm. de la Chapelle, *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. x. p. 105.—Mabillon, *Præfat. ad Sæc.* v. *Benedictin.* p. 53.

[*a*] Theſe were called the *Cauſæ Majores.*

The ſaints multiplied.

IV. The number of the ſaints, who were looked upon as miniſters of the kingdom of heaven, and whoſe patronage was eſteemed ſuch an unſpeakable bleſſing, was now multiplied every where, and the celeſtial courts were filled with new legions of this ſpecies of beings, ſome of which, as we have had formerly occaſion to obſerve, had no exiſtence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worſhipers. This multiplication of ſaints may be eaſily accounted for, when we conſider that ſuperſtition, the ſource of fear, was grown to ſuch an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons neceſſary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Beſides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid ſway, and the

[*w*] Almoſt all the donations that were made to the church during this century, carry evident marks of this groundleſs panic that had ſeized all the European nations, as the reaſons of theſe donations are generally expreſſed in the following words: *Appropinquante mundi termino*, &c. i. e. *The end of the world being now at hand*, &c. Among the many undeniable teſtimonies that we have from ancient records of this univerſal deluſion, that was ſo profitable to the ſacerdotal order, we ſhall confine ourſelves to the quotation of one very remarkable paſſage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, abbot of *Fleury*, *adverſus Arnulphum*, i. e. Arnoul biſhop of *Orleans*, which apology is publiſhed by the learned FRANCIS PITHOU, in the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Romanæ*, p. 401. The words of ABBO are as follow: *De fine quoque mundi coram populo ſermonem in Eccleſia Pariſiorum Adoleſcentulus audivi, quod ſtatim finito mille annorum numero Antichriſtus adveniret, et non longo poſt tempore univerſale judicium ſuccederet: cui prædicationi ex Evangeliis, ac Apocalypſi, et libro Danielis quâ potui virtute reſtiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi inolevit, Abbas meus beatæ memoriæ Richardus, ſagaci animo propulit, poſtquam litteras à Lotharienſibus accepit, quibus me reſpondere juſſit. Nam fama pœne totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annunciatio Dominica in Paraſceve contigiſſet, abſque ullo ſcrupulo finis ſæculi eſſet.*

licentiouſneſs and diſſolution that had ſo generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of ſanctity very eaſy to be acquired; for amidſt ſuch a perverſe generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be eſteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increaſe conſiderably the number of the celeſtial advocates. All thoſe, to whom nature had given an auſtere complexion, a gloomy temper, or an enthuſiaſtic imagination, were, in conſequence of an advantageous compariſon with the profligate multitude, revered as the favorites of heaven, and as the friends of God.

The Roman pontif, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating ſaints by his ſole authority, gave, in this century, the firſt ſpecimen of this ghoſtly power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exerciſed this privilege alone. This ſpecimen was given in the year 993, by JOHN XV, who, with all the formalities of a ſolemn canonization, enrolled UDALRIC, biſhop of *Augſburg*, in the number of the ſaints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worſhip and veneration of Chriſtians [x]. We muſt not, however, conclude from hence, that after this period the privilege of canonizing new ſaints was veſted ſolely in the Roman pontifs [y]; for there are ſeveral examples upon record which prove, that not only provincial councils, but alſo ſeveral of the firſt order among the biſhops, advanced to the rank of ſaints, ſuch as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celeſtial patrons of the church, without ever conſulting the Roman pontif, until the XIIth century [z]. Then ALEXANDER III abrogated this privilege of the biſhops and councils, and placed *canoziation* in the number of the more important acts of authority [a], which the ſovereign pontif alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exerciſe.

The merit of the commentators of this century conſidered.

V. The expoſitors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illuſtrate and explain the ſacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unſucceſsful in their undertakings to deſerve almoſt any notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of OLYMPIODORUS and OECUMENIUS are to be conſidered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins REMI, or REMIGIUS, biſhop of *Auxerre*, continued the expoſition of the holy ſcriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various reſpects; for he takes very little pains in explaining the literal ſenſe of the words, and employs the whole force of his fantaſtic genius in unfolding their pretended myſtical ſignification, which he looked upon as infinitely more intereſting than their plain and literal meaning. Beſides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally ſpeaking, mere compilations from ancient commentators.

---

[x] FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 259.

[y] This abſurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by PHIL. BONNANUS, in his *Numiſmata Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. i. p. 41.

[z] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 260. tom. iii. p. 30.—ARM. DE LA CHAPELLE, *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, tom. x. p. 105.—MABILLON, *Præfat. ad Sæc.* v. *Benedictin.* p. 53.

[a] Theſe were called the *Cauſæ Majores.*

mentators. As to the *Moral obſervations* of ODO *upon the book of Job* [b], they are tranſcribed from a work of GREGORY the Great, which bears the ſame title. We mention no more; if, however, any are deſirous of an ample account of thoſe who were eſteemed the principal commentators in this century, they will find it in a book wrote profeſſedly upon this ſubject by NOTKERUS BALBULUS.

The ſtate of theology and morals in this century.

VI. The ſcience of theology was abſolutely abandoned in this century, nor did either the Greek or Latin church furniſh any writer, who attempted to explain in a regular method the doctrines of Chriſtianity. The Greeks were contented with the works of DAMASCENUS, and the Latins with thoſe of AUGUSTIN and GREGORY, who were now conſidered as the greateſt doctors that had adorned the church. Some added to theſe the writings of venerable BEDE and RABANUS MAURUS. The important ſcience of morals was ſtill more neglected than that of theology in this wretched age, and was reduced to a certain number of dry and inſipid homilies, and to the lives of the ſaints, which SIMEON among the Greeks, and HUBALD, ODO, and STEPHEN [c] among the Latins, had drawn up with a ſeducing eloquence, that covered the moſt impertinent fictions. Such was the miſerable ſtate of morals and theology in this century; in which, as we may farther obſerve, there did not appear any defence of the Chriſtian religion againſt its profeſſed enemies.

The controverſies between the Greek and Latin churches.

VII. The controverſies between the Greek and Latin churches were now carried on with leſs noiſe and impetuoſity than in the preceding century, on account of the troubles and calamities of the times; yet they were not entirely reduced to ſilence [d]. The writers therefore who affirm, that this unhappy ſchiſm was healed, and that the contending parties were really reconciled to each other for a certain ſpace of time, have groſly miſtaken the matter [e]; though it be, indeed, true, that the tumults of the times produced now and then a ceſſation of theſe conteſts, and occaſioned ſeveral truces, which inſidiouſly concealed the bittereſt enmity, and ſerved often as a maſk to the moſt treacherous deſigns. The Greeks were, moreover, divided among themſelves, and diſputed with great warmth concerning the lawfulneſs of repeated marriages [f], to which violent conteſt the caſe of LEO, ſurnamed the *Philoſopher*, gave riſe. This emperor, having buried ſucceſſively three wives without having had by them any male iſſue, eſpouſed a fourth, whoſe name was ZOË CARBINOPSINA, and who was born in the obſcurity of a mean condition. As marriages repeated for the fourth time were held to be impure and unlawful by the Greek canons, NICOLAS, the patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, ſuſpended the emperor, upon this occaſion, from the communion of the church. LEO, incenſed at this rigorous proceeding, deprived NICOLAS of the patriarchal dignity, and raiſed EUTHYMIUS to that high office, who, though he re-admitted the emperor to the boſom of the church, yet oppoſed the law which he had reſolved to enact in order to render fourth marriages lawful. Upon this a ſchiſm, attended with the bittereſt animoſities, divided the clergy, one part of which declared for NICOLAS, the other for EUTHYMIUS. Some time after this, LEO died, and was ſucceeded in the empire by ALEXANDER, who depoſed EUTHYMIUS, and reſtored NICOLAS to his eminent rank in the church. No ſooner was this warm patriarch re-inſtated in his office, than he began to load the memory of the late emperor with the bittereſt execrations and the moſt opprobrious invectives, and to maintain the unlawfulneſs of fourth marriages with the utmoſt obſtinacy. In order to appeaſe theſe tumults, which portended numberleſs calamities to the ſtate, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENNETA, the ſon of LEO, called together an aſſembly of the clergy at *Conſtantinople* in the year 920, in which fourth marriages were abſolutely prohibited, and marriages for the third time were permitted on certain conditions; and thus the public tranquillity was reſtored [g].

---

[b] *Moralia in Jobum.*

[c] Biſhop of *Liege.*

[d] MICH. LEQUIEN *Diſſert.* i. *Damaſcenica de proceſſione Spiritus Sancti*, § xiii. p. 12.—FRED. SPANHEIM, *De perpetua diſſenſione Eccleſiæ Oriental. et Occidental.* part. iv. § vii. p. 529. tom. ii. Opp.

[e] LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua conſenſione Eccleſiæ Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. vii, viii. p. 600.

[(*f*) Fourth marriages, our author undoubtedly means, ſince ſecond and third nuptials were allowed upon certain conditions.]

Several other conteſts of like moment aroſe among the Greeks during this century, and they ſerve to convince us of the ignorance that prevailed among that people, and of their blind veneration and zeal for the opinions of their anceſtors.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Ceremonies multiplied.

I. IN order to have ſome notion of the load of ceremonies, under which the Chriſtian religion groaned during this ſuperſtitious age, we have only to caſt an eye upon the acts of the various councils which were aſſembled in *England*, *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*. The number of ceremonies increaſed in proportion to that of the ſaints, which multiplied from day to day; for each new ſaintly patron had appropriated to his ſervice, a new feſtival, a new form of worſhip, a new round of religious rites; and the clergy, notwithſtanding their groſs ſtupidity in other matters, diſcovered, in the creation of new ceremonies, a marvellous fertility of invention, attended with the utmoſt dexterity and artifice. It is alſo to be obſerved, that a great part of theſe new rites derived their origin from the various errors, which the barbarous nations had received from their anceſtors, and ſtill retained, even after their converſion to Chriſtianity. The clergy, inſtead of extirpating theſe errors, either gave them a Chriſtian aſpect by inventing certain religious rites to cover their deformity, or by explaining them in a forced allegorical manner, and thus they were perpetuated in the church, and devoutly tranſmitted from age to age. We may alſo attribute a conſiderable number of the rites and inſtitutions, that diſhonoured religion, in this century, to fooliſh notions both concerning the ſupreme Being, and departed ſaints; for they imagined that God, was like the princes and great ones of the earth, who are rendered propitious by coſtly preſent, and are delighted with thoſe cringing ſalutations, and other marks of veneration and homage which they receive from their ſubjects; and they believed likewiſe that departed ſpirits were agreeably affected with the ſame kind of ſervices.

---

[g] Theſe facts are faithfully collected from CEDRENUS, LEUNCLAVIUS *Jure Græco-Rom.* tom. i. p. 104. from LEO the grammarian, SIMEON the treaſurer, and other writers of the Byzantine hiſtory.

Feſtivals.

II. The famous yearly feſtival that was celebrated in remembrance of *all departed ſouls*, was inſtituted by the authority of ODILO, abbot of *Cluni*, and added to the Latin calendar towards the concluſion of this century [*h*]. Before this time a cuſtom had been introduced in many places of putting up prayers, on certain days, for the ſouls that were confined in purgatory; but theſe prayers were made by each religious ſociety, only for its own members, friends, and patrons. The pious zeal of ODILO could not be confined within ſuch narrow limits, and he therefore extended the benefit of theſe prayers to all the ſouls, that laboured under the pains and trials of *purgatory* [*i*]. This proceeding of ODILO was owing to the exhortations of a certain Sicilian hermit, who pretended to have learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the monks of *Cluni* would be effectual for the deliverance of departed ſpirits from the expiatory flames of a middle ſtate [*k*]. Accordingly this feſtival was, at firſt, celebrated only by the *congregation of Cluni*; but having received afterwards the approbation of one of the Roman pontifs, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin churches.

The office of the holy Virgin Mary.

III. The worſhip of the Virgin MARY, which, before this century, had been carried to a very high degree of idolatry, received now new acceſſions of ſolemnity and ſuperſtition. Towards the concluſion of this century, a cuſtom was introduced among the Latins of celebrating maſſes and abſtaining from fleſh in honour of the bleſſed Virgin, every Sabbath day. After this was inſtituted, what the Latins called, the *leſſer office*, in honour of St. MARY, which was, in the following century, confirmed by URBAN II, in the council of *Clermont*. There are alſo to be found in this age manifeſt indications of the inſtitution of the *roſary*, and *crown* of the Virgin, by which her worſhipers were to reckon the number of prayers that they were to offer to this new divinity; for though ſome place the invention of the *roſary* in the XIIIth century, and attribute it to St. DOMINIC, yet this ſuppoſition

Inſtitution of the roſary.

[*h*] In the year 998.

[*i*] See MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part i. p. 584. where the reader will find the *Life of Odilo*, with the decree he iſſued forth for the inſtitution of this feſtival.

[*k*] The late pontif BENEDICT XIV was artful enough to obſerve a profound ſilence with reſpect to the ſuperſtitious and diſhonourable origin of this anniverſary feſtival, in his treatiſe *De Feſtis J. Chriſti, Mariæ, et Sanctorum*, lib. iii. cap. xxii. p. 671. tom. x. Oper. and by this ſilence he has plainly ſhewn to the world what he thought of this abſurd feſtival. This is not the only mark of prudence and cunning, that is to be found in the works of that famous pontif.

is made without any foundation [*l*]. The *roſary* conſiſts in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and an hundred and fifty ſalutations of the bleſſed Virgin; while the *crown*, according to the different opinions of the learned concerning the age of the bleſſed Virgin, conſiſts in ſix or ſeven repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and ſix or ſeven times ten ſalutations, or *Ave Maria's*.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the hereſies and diviſions that troubled the church during this century.

Ancient hereſies continue.

I. THE profound ignorance and ſtupidity, that were productive of ſo many evils in this century, had, at leaſt, this advantage attending them, that they contributed much to the tranquillity of the church, and preventing the riſe of new ſects and new commotions of a religious kind. But, though no new inventions were broached, the ancient errors ſtill remained. The Neſtorians and Monophyſites lived ſtill under the Arabian government, where, however, they were much more rigorouſly treated than in former times, and were often perſecuted with the utmoſt injuſtice and violence. But as ſome of them excelled in medical knowledge, which was highly eſteemed among the Arabians, while others rendered themſelves acceptable to the great, by the dextrous management of their domeſtic affairs, as overſeers and ſtewards, all this contributed to diminiſh the violence of the ſtorms that aroſe againſt them from time to time.

The Paulicians.

II. The Manichæans or Paulicians, whoſe errors have been already pointed out, gathered conſiderable ſtrength in *Thrace* under the reign of JOHN TZIMISCES. A great part of this ſect had been tranſported into this province, by the order of CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, ſo early as the ſeventh century, to put an end to the troubles and tumults they had excited in the eaſt; but a ſtill greater number of them were left behind, eſpecially in *Syria* and the adjacent countries. Hence it was, that THEODORE, biſhop of *Antioch*, from a pious apprehenſion of the danger to which his flock lay expoſed from the neighbourhood of ſuch pernicious heretics, engaged the emperor, by his ardent and importunate ſollicitations, to ſend a new colony of theſe Manichæans from *Syria* to *Philippi* [*m*]. From *Thrace* this reſtleſs and turbulent ſect paſſed into *Bulgaria* and *Sclavonia*, where they reſided under the juriſdiction of their own pontif, or patriarch, until the time of the council of *Baſil*, i. e. until the xvth century. From *Bulgaria* the Paulicians removed into *Italy*, and ſpreading themſelves from thence through the other province of *Europe*, they became extremely troubleſome to the Roman pontifs upon many occaſions [*n*].

[*l*] This is demonſtrated by MABILLON, *Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* v. p. 58.

[*m*] Jo. ZONARAS *Annal.* lib. xvii. p. 209. edit. *Pariſ.* p. 164. edit. *Venet.*

[*n*] It is extremely probable, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, that the remains of this ſect are ſtill to be found in *Bulgaria*.

Troubles excited by Leuthard.

III. In the very laſt year of this century aroſe a certain teacher, whoſe name was LEUTARD, who lived at *Vertus*, in the dioceſe of *Chalons*, and, in a ſhort time, drew after him a conſiderable number of diſciples. This new doctor could not bear the ſuperſtitious worſhip of images, which he is ſaid to have oppoſed with the utmoſt vehemence, and even to have broke in pieces an image of CHRIST, which he found in a church where he went to perform his devotions. He, moreover, exclaimed with the greateſt warmth againſt paying tythes to the prieſts, and in ſeveral other reſpects ſhewed that he was no cordial friend to the ſacerdotal order. But that which ſhewed evidently that he was a dangerous fanatic, was his affirming that in the prophecies of the Old Teſtament there was a manifeſt mixture of truth and falſhood. GEBOUIN, biſhop of *Chalons*, examined the pretenſions which this man made to divine inſpiration, and expoſed his extravagance to the view of the public, whom he had ſo artfully ſeduced; upon which he threw himſelf into a well, and ended his days as many fanatics have done after him [*o*]. It is highly probable, that this upſtart doctor taught many other abſurd notions beſides thoſe which we have now mentioned, and that after his death, his diſciples made a part of the ſect that was afterwards known in *France* under the name of the Albigenſes, and which is ſaid to have adopted the Manichæan errors.

The Anthropomorphites.

IV. There were yet ſubſiſting ſome remains of the ſect of the Arians in ſeveral parts of *Italy*, and particularly in the territory of *Padua*; but RATHERIUS, biſhop of *Verona*, had a ſtill more enormous hereſy to combat in the ſyſtem of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in the year 939. In the diſtrict of *Vicenza*, a conſiderable number not only of the illiterate multitude, but alſo of the ſacerdotal order, fell into that moſt abſurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was cloathed with a human form, and ſeated, like an earthly monarch, upon a throne of gold, and that his angelic miniſters were men arrayed in white garments, and furniſhed with wings to render them more expeditious in executing their ſovereign's orders. This monſtrous error will appear leſs aſtoniſhing, when we conſider, that the ſtupid and illiterate multitude had conſtantly before their eyes in all the churches, the ſupreme Being and his angels repreſented in pictures and images with the human figure.

The ſuperſtition of another ſet of blinded wretches, mentioned alſo by RATHERIUS, was yet more unaccountable and abſurd than that of the Anthropomorphites; for they imagined that, every Monday, maſs was performed in heaven by St. MICHAEL in the preſence of God, and hence on that day they reſorted in crowds to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly-honoured ſaint [*p*]. It is more than probable, that the avarice of the prieſts, who officiated in the church of St. MICHAEL, was the real ſource of this extravagant fancy; and that in this, as in many other caſes, a rapacious clergy took advantage of the credulity of the people, and made them believe whatever they thought would contribute to augment the opulence of the church.

[*o*] All this is related by GLABER RADULPHUS *Hiſt.* lib. ii. cap. xi.

[*p*] RATHERII *Epiſt. Synodica* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Scrip. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 294.—SIGEBERTUS *Gemblac. Chronol. ad A.* 939.

THE

ELEVENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

Chriſtianity propagated.

I. IN the preceding century ſome faint notions of the Chriſtian religion, ſome ſcattered rays of that divine light which it adminiſters to mortals, had been received among the Hungarians, Danes, Poles, and Ruſſians; but the rude and ſavage ſpirit of theſe nations, together with their deplorable ignorance and their violent attachment to the ſuperſtitions of their anceſtors, rendered their total converſion to Chriſtianity a work of great difficulty, and which could not be accompliſhed all of a ſudden. The zeal, however, with which this important work was carried on, did much honour to the piety of the princes and governors of theſe unpoliſhed countries, who united their influence with the labours of the learned men whom they had invited into their dominions, in order to open the eyes of their ſubjects upon the truth [*a*]. In *Tartary* [*b*], and the adjacent countries, the zeal and diligence of the Neſtorians gained over daily vaſt numbers to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. It appears alſo evident from a multitude of unexceptionable teſtimonies, that Metropolitan prelates, with a great number of inferior biſhops under their juriſdiction, were eſtabliſhed at this time in the provinces of *Caſgar*, *Nuacheta*, *Turkeſtan*, *Genda*, and *Tangut* [*c*]; from which we may conclude, that, in this and the following century, there was a prodigious number of Chriſtians in thoſe very countries, which are at preſent over-run with mahometaniſm and idolatry. All theſe Chriſtians were undoubtedly Neſtorians, and lived under the juriſdiction of the patriarch of that ſect, who reſided in *Chaldæa*.

[*a*] For an account of the Poles, Ruſſians, and Hungarians, ſee ROMUALDI *Vita in Actis Sanctor.* tom. ii. Februar. p. 113, 114. 117.

[*b*] *Tartary* is taken here in its moſt comprehenſive ſenſe; for between the inhabitants of *Tartary*, properly ſo called, and the Calmucs, Mogols, and the inhabitants of *Tangut*, there is a manifeſt difference.

[*c*] MARCUS PAUL. VENETUS *De Regionibus Orientalibus*, lib i. cap. 38. 40. 45. 47, 48, 49. 62, 63, 64. lib. ii. cap. 39.—EUSEB. RENAUDOT *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*,

The converſion of certain nations attempted in vain.

II. Among the European nations that lay yet groveling in their native darkneſs and ſuperſtition, were the Sclavonians, the Obotriti [*d*], the Venedi [*e*], and the Pruſſians, whoſe converſion had been attempted, but with little or no ſucceſs, by certain miſſionaries, from whoſe piety and zeal better fruits might have been expected. Towards the concluſion of the preceding century, **Adalbert**, biſhop of *Prague*, had endeavoured to inſtil into the minds of the fierce and ſavage Pruſſians, the ſalutary doctrines of the goſpel; but he periſhed in the fruitleſs attempt, and received, in the year 996, from the murdering lance of **Siggo**, a Pagan prieſt, the crown of martyrdom [*f*]. **Boleslaus**, king of *Poland*, revenged the death of this pious apoſtle by entering into a bloody war with the Pruſſians, and he obtained by the force of penal laws and of a victorious army, what **Adalbert** could not effect by exhortation and argument [*g*]. He dragooned this ſavage people into the Chriſtian church, yet beſides this violent method of converſion, others of a more gentle kind were certainly practiſed by the attendants of **Boleslaus**, who ſeconded the military arguments of their prince by the more perſuaſive influence of admonition and inſtruction. A certain eccleſiaſtic of illuſtrious birth, whoſe name was **Boniface**, and who was one of the diſciples of St. **Romuald**, undertook the converſion of the Pruſſians, and was ſucceeded in this pious enterprize by **Bruno** [*h*], who ſet out from *Germany* with a company of eighteen perſons who had entered with zeal into the ſame laudable deſign. Theſe were, however, all barbarouſly maſſacred by the fierce and cruel Pruſſians, and neither the vigorous efforts of **Boleslaus**, nor of

---

p. 420.—**Jos. Simon. Assemani** *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. D. II, &c. This ſucceſsful propagation of the goſpel, by the miniſtry of the Neſtorians, in *Tartary*, *China*, and the neighbouring provinces, is a moſt important event, and every way worthy to employ the reſearches and the pen of ſome able writer, well verſed in the knowledge of oriental hiſtory. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that, if this ſubject be important, it is alſo difficult on many accounts. It was attempted, however, notwithſtanding its difficulty by the moſt learned **Theoph. Sigifred. Bayer**, who had collected a great quantity of materials relative to this intereſting branch of the hiſtory of Chriſtianity, both from the works that have been publiſhed upon this ſubject, and from manuſcripts that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious. But, unhappily for the republic of letters, the death of that excellent man interrupted his labours, and prevented him from executing a deſign, which was worthy of his ſuperior abilities, and his well-known zeal, for the intereſts of religion.

[(*d*] The Obotriti were a great and powerful branch of the Vandals, whoſe kings reſided in the country of *Mecklenburg*, and whoſe domination extended along the coaſts of *Baltic* from the river *Pene* in *Pomerania* to the dutchy of *Holſtein*.]

[(*e*) The Venedi dwelt upon the banks of the *Weiſſel*, or *Viſtula*, in, what is at preſent called, the Palatinate of *Marienburg*.]

[*f*] See the *Acta Sanctor. ad d.* xxiii Aprilis, p. 174.

[*g*] **Solignac** *Hiſt. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 133.

[(*h*) **Fleury** differs from Dr. **Mosheim** in his account of *Bruno*, in two points. Firſt he maintains, that *Boniface* and *Bruno* were one and the ſame perſon, and here he is manifeſtly in the right; but he maintains farther, that he ſuffered martyrdom in *Ruſſia*, in which he is evidently miſtaken. It is proper farther to admoniſh the reader to diſtinguiſh carefully the *Bruno* here mentioned, from a monk of the ſame name, who founded the order of the Carthuſians.]

the ſucceeding kings of *Poland*, could engage this rude and inflexible nation to abandon totally the idolatry of their anceſtors [*i*].

The Saracens driven out of Sicily.

III. *Sicily* had been groaning under the dominion of the Saracens ſince the IXth century, nor had the repeated attempts of the Greeks and Latins to diſpoſſeſs them of that rich and fertile country, been hitherto crowned with the deſired ſucceſs. But in this century the face of affairs changed entirely in that iſland; for in the year 1059, ROBERT GUISCARD, who had formed a ſettlement in *Italy* at the head of a Norman colony, and was afterwards created duke of *Apulia*, encouraged by the exhortations of the Roman pontif NICOLAS II, and ſeconded by the aſſiſtance of his brother ROGER, attacked with the greateſt vigour and intrepidity the Saracens in *Sicily*; nor did this latter ſheath the victorious ſword, before he had rendered himſelf maſter of that iſland, and cleared it abſolutely of its former tyrants. As ſoon as this great work was accompliſhed, which was not before the year 1090, Count ROGER not only reſtored to its former glory and luſtre the Chriſtian religion, which had been almoſt totally extinguiſhed under the Saracen yoke, but alſo eſtabliſhed biſhoprics, founded monaſteries, erected magnificent churches throughout that province, and beſtowed upon the clergy thoſe immenſe revenues and thoſe diſtinguiſhed honours which they ſtill enjoy [*k*]. It is in the privileges conferred upon this valiant chief, that we find the origin of that ſupreme authority in matters of religion, which is ſtill veſted in the kings of *Sicily*, within the limits of their own territories, and which is known by the name of the *Sicilian monarchy*; for the Roman pontif URBAN II is ſaid to have granted, A. D. 1097, by a ſpecial diploma, to ROGER and his ſucceſſors the title, authority, and prerogatives of hereditary legates of the apoſtolic ſee. The court of *Rome* affirms, that this diploma is not authentic: and hence thoſe warm contentions, about the ſpiritual ſupremacy, that have ariſen even in our times between the biſhops of *Rome* and the kings of *Sicily*. The ſucceſſors of ROGER governed that iſland, under the title of dukes, until the XIIth century, when it was erected into a kingdom [*l*].

Expeditions formed againſt the Saracens in Paleſtine.

IV. The Roman pontifs, from the time of SILVESTER II, had been forming plans for extending the limits of the church in *Aſia*, and eſpecially for driving the Mahometans out of *Paleſtine*; but the troubles, in which *Europe* was ſo long involved, prevented the execution of theſe arduous deſigns. GREGORY VII, the moſt enterprizing and audacious pontif that ever ſat in the Apoſtolic chair, animated and inflamed by the repeated complaints which the aſiatic Chriſtians made of the cruelty of the Saracens, reſolved to undertake in perſon a holy war for the deliverance of the church, and upwards of fifty thouſand men were already muſtered to follow him in this bold expedition [*m*]. But his quarrel with the emperor HENRY IV, of which we ſhall

---

[i] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iv. *ad Annum* 1008. p. 97.—CHRIST. HARTKNOCH's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Pruſſia*, book I. ch. i. p. 12.

[k] See BURIGNI *Hiſtoire Generale de la Sicile*, tom. i. p. 386.

[l] See BARONII *Liber de Monarchia Siciliæ*, tom. xi. *Annal.* as alſo DU PIN *Traité de la Monarchie Sicilienne*.

[m] GREGORII VII *Epiſt.* lib. ii. 3. in HARDUINI *Conciliis*, tom. vi. part. I. p. 1285.

have occaſion to ſpeak hereafter, and other unforeſeen occurrences, obliged him to lay aſide his intended invaſion of the holy land. The project, however, was renewed, towards the concluſion of this century, by the enthuſiaſtic zeal of an inhabitant of *Amiens*, who was known by the name of PETER the Hermit, and who ſuggeſted to the Roman pontif URBAN II the means of accompliſhing what had been unluckily ſuſpended. This famous hermit, in a voyage which he had made through *Paleſtine* A. D. 1093, had obſerved, with inexpreſſible anguiſh, the vexations and perſecutions which the Chriſtians, who viſited the holy places, ſuffered from the barbarous and tyrannic Saracens. Inflamed therefore with a holy indignation and a furious zeal, which he looked upon as the effects of a divine impulſe, he implored the ſuccours of SYMEON, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and URBAN II, but without effect. Far from being diſcouraged by this, he renewed his efforts with the utmoſt vigour, went through all the countries of *Europe* ſounding the alarm of a *holy war* againſt the infidel nations, and exhorting all Chriſtian princes to draw the ſword againſt the tyrants of *Paleſtine*; nor did he ſtop here; but with a view to engage the ſuperſtitious and ignorant multitude in his cauſe, he carried about with him a letter, which he ſaid was written in heaven, and addreſſed from thence to all true Chriſtians to animate their zeal for the deliverance of their brethren, who groaned under the oppreſſive burthen of a Mahometan yoke [*n*].

The progreſs of the holy war.

V. When URBAN II ſaw the way prepared by the exhortations of the hermit, who had put the ſpirits of the people every where in a ferment, and had kindled in their breaſts a vehement zeal for that holy carnage which the church had been meditating ſo long, he aſſembled a grand and numerous council at *Placentia* A. D. 1095, and recommended warmly, for the firſt time, the ſacred expedition againſt the infidel Saracens [*o*]. This arduous enterprize was far from being approved of by the greateſt part of this numerous aſſembly, notwithſtanding the preſence of the emperor's legates, who, in their maſter's name, repreſented moſt pathetically how neceſſary it was to ſet limits to the power of the victorious Turks, whoſe authority and dominion increaſed from day to day. The pontif's propoſal was, however, renewed with the ſame zeal, and with the deſired ſucceſs, ſome time after this, in the council aſſembled at *Clermont*, where URBAN was preſent. The pompous and pathetic ſpeech, which he delivered upon this occaſion, made a deep and powerful impreſſion upon the minds of the French, whoſe natural character renders them much ſuperior to the Italians in encountring difficulties, facing danger, and attempting the execution of the moſt perilous deſigns. So that an innumerable multitude, compoſed of all ranks and orders in the nation, offered themſelves as volunteers in this ſacred expedition[p]. This numerous hoſt was looked upon as formidable in the higheſt degree, and equal to the moſt glorious enterprizes and exploits, while, in reality, it was no more than an unwieldly body without life and vigour, and was weak and contemptible in every reſpect. This will appear ſufficiently evident, when we conſider that this army was a motley aſſemblage of monks, whores, artiſts, labourers, lazy tradeſmen, merchants, boys, girls, ſlaves, malefactors, and profligate debauchees, and that it was principally compoſed of the loweſt dregs of the multitude, who were animated ſolely by the proſpect of ſpoil and plunder, and hoped to make their fortunes by this holy campaign. Every one will perceive how little either diſcipline, counſel, or fortitude were to be expected from ſuch a miſerable rabble. This expedition was diſtinguiſhed by the name of a *croiſade*, and all who embarked in it were called *croiſe's*, or croſs-bearers; not only becauſe the end of this holy war was to wreſt the croſs of CHRIST out of the hands of the infidels, but alſo on account of the conſecrated croſs of various colours, which every ſoldier wore upon his right ſhoulder [*q*].

[*n*] This circumſtance is mentioned by the abbot DODECHINUS, in his *Continuat. Chronici Mariani Scoti Scriptor. Germanicor.* JO. PISTORII, tom. i. p. 462. For an account of PETER, ſee DU FRESNE *Notæ ad Annæ Comnenæ Alexiadem*, p. 79. edit. *Venet.*

[(*o*) This council was the moſt numerous of any that had been hitherto aſſembled, and was, on that account, held in the open fields. There were preſent at it two hundred biſhops, four thouſand eccleſiaſtics, and three hundred thouſand laymen.]

The hiſtory of this holy war.

VI. In conſequence of theſe grand preparations, eight hundred thouſand men, in ſeparate bodies, and under different commanders, ſet out for *Conſtantinople* in the year 1096; that having received there both aſſiſtance and direction from ALEXIS COMNENIUS the Grecian emperor, they might purſue their march into *Aſia*. One of the principal diviſions of this enormous body was led on by PETER the Hermit, the author and fomenter of the war, who was girded with a rope, and continued to appear with all the marks of an auſtere ſolitary. This firſt diviſion, in their march through *Hungary* and *Thrace*, committed the moſt flagitious crimes, which ſo incenſed the inhabitants of the countries through which they paſſed, particularly thoſe of *Hungary* and *Turcomania*, that they roſe up in arms and maſſacred the greateſt part of them. A like fate attended ſeveral other diviſions of the ſame army, who, under the conduct of weak and unſkilful chiefs, wandered about like an undiſciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and ſpreading miſery and deſolation wherever they came. The armies, that were headed by illuſtrious commanders, diſtinguiſhed by their birth and their military endowments, arrived more happily at the capital of the Grecian empire. That which was commanded by GODFREY of *Bouillon*, duke of *Lorrain*, who deſerves a place among the greateſt heros, whether of ancient or modern times [*r*], and, by his brother BALDWIN, was compoſed of eighty thouſand well choſen troops, horſe and foot [*s*], and directed its march through *Germany* and *Hungary*. Another, which was headed by RAIMOND, earl of *Toulouſe*, paſſed through the Sclavonian territories. ROBERT earl of *Flanders*, ROBERT duke of *Normandy* [t], HUGO, brother to PHILIP I, king of *France*, embarked their reſpective forces in a fleet which was aſſembled at *Brundiſi* and *Tarento*, from whence they were tranſported to *Durazzo*, or *Dyrrachium*, as it was anciently called. Theſe armies were followed by BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, at the head of a choſen and numerous body of valiant Normans.

---

[p] THEOD. RUINART. *in Vita Urbani* II, § ccxxv. p. 224. 299, 240. 272. 274. 282. 296. tom. iii. Opp. Poſthum.—JO. MABILLONI et THEOD. RUINARTI, JO. HARDUINI *Concilior.* tom. xi. part. II. p. 1726.—BARONIUS *Annal. Eccl.* tom. xi. *ad A.* 1095. *n.* xxxii. p. 648.

[q] See ABRAH. BZOVIUS *Continuat. Annal. Baronii*, tom. xv. *ad A.* 1410. *n.* ix. p. 322. ed. *Colon.*—L'ENFANT *Hiſtoire du Concile de Piſe*, tom. ii. lib. v. p. 60.—The writers who have treated of this holy war are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toto orbe exoriens*, cap. xxx. p. 518.

[r] The Benedictine monks have given an ample account of this magnanimous chief, whoſe character was a bright aſſemblage of all chriſtian, civil, and heroic virtues, in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 598.

[s] The engaging and illuſtrious virtues of GODFREY had drawn from all parts a prodigious number of volunteers, who were ambitious to fight under his ſtandards. This enormous multitude

VII. This army was the greateſt, and, in outward appearance, the moſt formidable, that had been known in the memory of man; and, though before its arrival at *Conſtantinople*, it was diminiſhed conſiderably by the difficulties and oppoſitions it had met with on the way; yet ſuch as it was, it made the Grecian emperor tremble, and filled his mind with the moſt anxious and terrible apprehenſions of ſome ſecret deſign againſt his dominions. His fears, however, were diſpelled, when he ſaw theſe legions paſs the ſtreights of *Gallipolis*, and direct their march towards *Bithynia* [u].

The firſt ſucceſsful enterprize [w] that was formed againſt the Infidels, was the ſiege of *Nice*, the capital of *Bithynia*, which was taken in the year 1097; from thence the victorious army proceeded into *Syria*, and, in the following year, ſubdued *Antioch*, which, with its fertile territory, was granted, by the aſſembled chiefs, to BOEMOND, duke of *Apulia*. *Edeſſa* fell next into the hands of the victors, and became the property of BALDWIN, brother to GODFREY of *Bouillon*. The conqueſt of *Jeruſalem*, which, after

---

perplexed, however, the valiant chief, who, on that account, divided it into ſeveral bodies, and finding in PETER the Hermit the ſame ambitious and military ſpirit that had prevailed in him before his retreat from the world, declared him the general of the firſt diviſion, which was detached from the reſt, and ordered to march immediately to *Conſtantinople*. By this means, GODFREY got rid of the dregs of that aſtoniſhing multitude which flocked to his camp. Father MAIMBOURG, notwithſtanding his immoderate zeal for the holy war, and that fabulous turn which enables him to repreſent it in the moſt favorable points of view, acknowledges frankly, that the firſt diviſions of this prodigious army committed the moſt abominable enormities in the countries through which they paſſed, and that there was no kind of inſolence, injuſtice, impurity, barbarity, and violence of which they were not guilty. Nothing perhaps in the annals of hiſtory can equal the flagitious deeds of this infernal rabble. See particularly MAIMBOURG, *Hiſtoire des Croiſades*, tom. i. livre i. p. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62. 2^{d} edit. in 12mo.]

[(*t*) Eldeſt ſon of WILLIAM the Conqueror.]

[(*u*) Our author, for the ſake of brevity, paſſes over the conteſts and jealouſies that ſubſiſted between the chief of the cruſade and the Grecian emperor. The character of the latter is differently painted by different hiſtorians. The warm defenders of the cruſade repreſent him as a moſt perfidious prince, who, under the ſhew of friendſhip and zeal, aimed at nothing leſs than the deſtruction of GODFREY's army. Others conſider him as a wiſe prudent politician, who, by artifice and ſtratagem, warded off the danger he had reaſon to apprehend from theſe formidable legions that paſſed through his dominions; and part of which, particularly the army commanded by PETER the Hermit, ravaged his moſt fruitful territories in the moſt barbarous manner, and pillaged and plundered even the ſuburbs of the capital of the empire. The truth of the matter is, that if ALEXIS cannot be vindicated from the charge of perfidy, the holy warriors are on the other hand, chargeable with many acts of brutality and injuſtice. See MAIMBURG, *Hiſtoire des Croiſades*, livre i. et ii.]

[(*w*) Before the arrival of GODFREY in *Aſia*, the army, or rather rabble, commanded by PETER the Hermit in ſuch a ridiculous manner as might be expected from a wrongheaded monk, was defeated and cut to pieces by the young SOLIMAN.]

a ſiege of five weeks, ſubmitted to their arms in the year 1099, ſeemed to crown their expedition with the deſired ſucceſs. In this city were laid the foundations of a new kingdom, at the head of which was placed the famous GODFREY, whom the army ſaluted king of *Jeruſalem* with a unanimous voice. But this illuſtrious hero, whoſe other eminent qualities were adorned with the greateſt modeſty, refuſed that high title [x], though he governed *Jeruſalem* with that valour, equity, and prudence, that have rendered his name immortal. Having choſen a ſmall army to ſupport him in his new dignity, he permitted the reſt of the troops to return into *Europe*. He did not, however, enjoy long the fruits of a victory, in which his heroic valour had been ſo glorioſly diſplayed, but died about a year after the conqueſt of *Jeruſalem*, leaving his dominions to his brother BALDWIN, prince of *Edeſſa*, who aſſumed the title of king without the leaſt heſitation.

The motives which engaged the biſhops of Rome and the princes of Europe in this holy war.

VIII. If we examine the motives that engaged the Roman pontifs, and particularly URBAN II, to kindle this holy war, which in its progreſs and iſſue was ſo detrimental to almoſt all the countries of *Europe*, we ſhall probably be perſuaded that its origin is to be derived from the corrupt notions of religion, which prevailed in theſe barbarous times. It was thought inconſiſtent, with the duty and character of Chriſtians, to ſuffer that land, that was bleſſed with the miniſtry, diſtinguiſhed by the miracles, and conſecrated by the blood of the Saviour of men, to remain under the dominion of his moſt inveterate enemies. It was alſo looked upon as a very important branch of true piety to viſit the holy places in *Paleſtine*; which pilgrimages, however, were extremely dangerous, while the deſpotic Saracens were in poſſeſſion of that country. Nor will we deny, that theſe motives of a religious kind were accompanied and rendered more effectual by an anxious apprehenſion of the growing power of the Turks, who had already ſubdued the greateſt part of the Grecian empire, and might ſoon carry into *Europe*, and more particularly into *Italy*, their victorious arms.

There are, it muſt be confeſſed, ſeveral learned men who have accounted otherwiſe for this pious, or rather fanatical, expedition. They imagine that the Roman pontifs recommended this ſacred campaign with a view to augment their own authority, and to weaken the power of the Latin emperors and princes; and that theſe princes countenanced and encouraged it in hopes of getting rid, by that means, of their more powerful and warlike vaſſals, and of becoming maſters of their lands and poſſeſſions [y]. Theſe

---

[(x) All the hiſtorians, who write concerning this holy war, applaud the anſwer which GODFREY returned to the offer that was made him of a crown of gold, as a mark of his acceſſion to the throne of *Jeruſalem*; the anſwer was, that *he could not bear the thoughts of wearing a crown of gold in that city, where the* KING OF KINGS *had been crowned with thorns*. This anſwer was ſublime in the xIth century.]

[y] The part of this hypotheſis, that relates to the views of the Roman pontifs, has been adopted as an undoubted truth, not only by many proteſtant hiſtorians, but alſo by ſeveral writers of the Roman communion. See BENED. ACCOLTUS *De bello Sacro in Infideles*, lib. i. p. 16.—BASNAGE *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. period. v. p. 235.—VERTOT *Hiſtoire des Chevaliers de Malthe*, tom. i. livre iii. p. 302. 308. livre iv. p. 428.—BAILLET *Hiſtoire des demelez du Boniface* VIII, *avec Philippe le Bel*, p. 76.—*Hiſtoire du droit Eccleſiaſtique François*, tom. i. 296. 299. To ſuch, however, as conſider matters attentively, this hypotheſis will appear deſtitute of any ſolid

conjectures, however plauſible in appearance, are ſtill no more than conjectures. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this; that the Roman pontifs and the European princes were engaged at firſt in theſe *cruſades* by a principle of ſuperſtition only; but when, in proceſs of time, they learned by experience, that theſe holy wars contributed much to increaſe their opulence and to extend their authority, by ſacrificing their wealthy and powerful rivals, then new motives were preſented to encourage theſe ſacred expeditions into *Paleſtine*, and ambition and avarice ſeconded and enforced the dictates of fanaticiſm and ſuperſtition.

Its unhappy conſequences, and the innumerable evils that attended it.

IX. Without determining any thing concerning the juſtice or injuſtice [z] of theſe holy wars, we may boldly affirm, that they were highly prejudicial both to the cauſe of religion, and to the civil intereſts of mankind, and that,

---

foundation. Certain it is, that the Roman pontifs could never have either foreſeen, or imagined, that ſo many European princes, and ſuch prodigious multitudes of people, would take arms againſt the infidels, and march into *Paleſtine*; nor could they be aſſured beforehand, that this expedition would tend to the advancement of their opulence and authority. For all the acceſſions of influence and wealth, which the Roman pontifs, and the clergy in general derived from theſe holy wars, were of a much later date, than their firſt origin, and were acquired by degrees, rather by lucky hits, than by deep laid ſchemes; and this alone is ſufficient to ſhew, that the biſhops of *Rome*, in forming the plan and exhorting to the proſecution of theſe wars, had no thoughts of extending thereby the limits of their authority. We may add to this conſideration another of no leſs weight in the matter before us, and that is, the general opinion which prevailed at this time, both among the clergy and the people, that the conqueſt of *Paleſtine* would be finiſhed in a ſhort time, in a ſingle campaign; that the divine providence would interpoſe, in a miraculous manner, to accompliſh the ruin of the infidels; and that, after the taking of *Jeruſalem*, the greateſt part of the European princes would return home with their troops, which laſt circumſtance was by no means favorable to the views which the pontifs are ſuppoſed to have formed of increaſing their opulence and extending their dominion. Of all the conjectures that have been entertained upon this ſubject, the moſt improbable and groundleſs is that which ſuppoſes that URBAN II recommended, with ſuch ardor, this expedition into *Paleſtine*, with a view to weaken the power of the emperor HENRY IV, with whom he had a violent diſpute concerning the inveſtiture of biſhops. They, who adopt this conjecture, muſt be little acquainted with the hiſtory of theſe times; or at leaſt they forget, that the firſt armies, that marched into *Paleſtine* againſt the infidels, were chiefly compoſed of Franks and Normans, and that the Germans, who were the enemies of URBAN II, were, in the beginning, extremely averſe to this ſacred expedition. Many other conſiderations might be added here to illuſtrate this matter, which, for the ſake of brevity, I paſs in ſilence.

That part of the hythotheſis, which relates to the kings and princes of *Europe*, and ſuppoſes that they countenanced the holy war, to get rid of their powerful vaſſals, is as groundleſs as the other, which we have been now refuting. It is, indeed, adopted by ſeveral eminent writers, ſuch as VERTOT (*Hiſt. de Malthe*, livre iii. p. 309.) BOULAINVILLIERS, and others, who pretend to a ſuperior and uncommon inſight into the policy of theſe remote ages. The reaſons, however, which theſe great men employ to ſupport their opinion, may be all comprehended in this ſingle argument: *viz.* “Many kings, eſpecially among the Franks, became more opulent and powerful “by the numbers of their vaſſals, who loſt their lives and fortunes in this holy war; *therefore*, theſe “princes not only permitted, but warmly countenanced the proſecution of this war from ſelfiſh and “ambitious principles.” The weakneſs of this concluſion muſt ſtrike every one at firſt ſight. We are wonderfully prone to attribute both to the Roman pontifs, and the princes of this barbarous age much more ſagacity and cunning, than they really poſſeſſed; and we deduce from the events, the principles and views of the actors, which is a defective and uncertain manner of reaſoning. With reſpect to the Roman pontifs, it appears moſt probable that their immenſe opulence and authority were acquired, rather by their improving dexterouſly the opportunities that were offered them, than by the ſchemes they formed for extending their dominion, or filling their coffers.

[z] I do not pretend to decide the queſtion concerning the lawfulneſs of the cruſades; a queſtion, which, when it is conſidered with attention and impartiality, will appear not only extremely difficult, but alſo highly doubtful. It is, however, proper to inform the reader, that in the XII and

in *Europe* more eſpecially, they were fruitful of innumerable evils and calamities, whoſe effects are yet perceivable in our times. The European nations were deprived of the greateſt part of their inhabitants by theſe ill-judged expeditions; immenſe ſums of money were exported into *Aſia* for the ſupport of the war; and numbers of the moſt powerful and opulent families became either extinct, or were involved in the deepeſt miſeries of poverty and want. It could not well be otherwiſe; ſince the heads of the moſt illuſtrious houſes either mortgaged or ſold their lands and poſſeſſions in order to pay the expences of their voyage [*a*]; while others impoſed ſuch intolerable burthens upon their vaſſals and tenants, as obliged them to

---

xiiith centuries the juſtice of this holy war was called in queſtion, and warmly diſputed among Chriſtians. The Waldenſes and Albigenſes, who were diſtinguiſhed by the name of Cathari, or Puritans, conſidered theſe expeditions into *Paleſtine* as abſolutely unlawful. The reaſons they alledged were collected and combated by Francis Moneta, a Dominican friar of the xiiith century, in a book entitled *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenſes*, lib. v. cap. xiii. p. 531. which was publiſhed ſome years ago at *Rome* by Richini. But neither the objections of the Waldenſes, nor the anſwers of Moneta, were at all remarkable for their weight and ſolidity, as will appear evidently from the following example: The former objected to the holy war the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 32. *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles.* By the *Gentiles*, ſaid they, are to be underſtood the Saracens. And therefore the European Chriſtians are to abſtain from making war upon the Saracens, leſt they give offence to the *Gentiles*. We ſhall give Moneta's anſwer to this argument in his own words: *We read*, ſays he, Genes. xii. 7. *that God ſaid unto Abraham, Unto thy ſeed will I give this land: Now we* (Chriſtians who dwell in *Europe*) *are the ſeed of Abraham, as the apoſtle affirms,* Galat. iii 29 *Therefore we are heirs of the promiſe, and the holy land is given to us by the covenant as our lawful poſſeſſion. From all which it appears, that it is the duty of civil and temporal rulers to uſe their moſt zealous efforts to put us in poſſeſſion of the promiſed land, while it is, at the ſame time, incumbent upon the church and its miniſters to exhort theſe rulers in the moſt urgent manner to the performance of their duty.* A rare argument this *truly!* but let us hear him out: *The church has no deſign to injure, or ſlaughter the Saracens, nor is ſuch the intention of the Chriſtian princes engaged in this war. Yet the blood of the infidels muſt of neceſſity be ſhed, if they make reſiſtance and oppoſe the victorious arms of the princes. The church of God therefore is entirely innocent and without reproach in this matter, and gives no offence to the Gentiles, becauſe it does no more, in reality, than maintain its undoubted right.* Such is the ſubtile reaſoning of Moneta, on which it is not neceſſary to make any reflexions.

[Dr. Mosheim ſeems too modeſt, nay even timorous in his manner of expreſſing himſelf concerning the juſtice of this holy war, which was ſo abſurd in its principle, and ſo abominable in the odious circumſtances that attended it. His reſpect, perhaps, for the Teutonic croſſes which abound in *Germany*, and are the marks of an order which derives its origin from theſe fanatical expeditions into *Paleſtine*, may have occaſioned that ambiguity and circumſpection in his expreſſions, through which, however, it is eaſy to perceive his diſapprobation of the cruſades.—The holy place profaned by the dominion of infidels, was the apparent pretext of this fanatical war. What holy place? *Jeruſalem*, ſay the knights errant of *Paleſtine*. But they forget that *Jeruſalem* was a city, which, by the conduct of its inhabitants and the crucifixion of Christ, was become moſt odious in the eye of God; that it was viſibly loaded with a divine malediction, and was the miſerable theatre of the moſt tremendous judgments and calamities that ever were inflicted upon any nation. Had the caſe been otherwiſe, we know of no right which Chriſtianity gives its profeſſors to ſeize upon the territories, and invade the poſſeſſions of unbelievers. Had the Jews attempted the conqueſt of *Paleſtine*, they would have acted conformably with their apparent rights; becauſe it was formerly their country, and conſiſtently alſo with their religious principles; becauſe they expected a Meſſiah who was to *bind the kings of the gentiles in chains*, and to reduce the whole world under the Jewiſh yoke.]

[a] We find many memorable examples of this in the ancient records. Robert, duke of *Normandy*, mortgaged his dutchy to his brother William, king of *England*, to defray the expences of his voyage to *Paleſtine*. See the *Hiſtor. Major* of Matthew Paris, lib. i. p. 24 —

abandon their houſes, and all their domeſtic concerns, and to enliſt themſelves, rather through wild deſpair than religious zeal, under the ſacred banner of the croſs. Hence the face of *Europe* was totally changed, and all things thrown into the utmoſt confuſion. We paſs in ſilence the various enormities that were occaſioned by theſe cruſades, the murders, rapes, and robberies of the moſt infernal nature that were every where committed with impunity by theſe holy ſoldiers of GOD and of CHRIST, as they were impiouſly called; nor ſhall we enter into a detail of the new privileges and rights, to which theſe wars gave riſe, and which were often attended with the greateſt inconveniencies [*b*].

Its unhappy effects, conſidered with reſpect to the ſtate of religion.

X. Theſe holy wars were not leſs prejudicial to the cauſe of religion, and the true intereſts of the Chriſtian church, than they were to the temporal concerns of men. One of their firſt and moſt pernicious effects was the enormous augmentation of the influence and authority of the Roman pontifs: they alſo contributed, in various ways to enrich the churches and monaſteries with daily acceſſions of wealth, and to open new ſources of opulence to all the ſacerdotal orders. For they, who aſſumed the croſs, diſpoſed of their poſſeſſions as if they were at the point of death, and this on account of the imminent and innumerable dangers they were to be expoſed to in their paſſage to the holy land, and the oppoſition they were to encounter there upon their arrival [*c*]. They therefore, for the moſt part, made their wills before their departure, and left a conſiderable part of their poſſeſſions to the prieſts and monks, in order to obtain by theſe *pious* legacies, the favour and protection of the Deity [*d*]. Many examples of theſe donations are to be found in ancient records. Such of the *holy* ſoldiers, as had been engaged in ſuits of law with the prieſts or monks, renounced their pretenſions, and ſubmiſſively gave up whatever it was, that had been the ſubject of debate. And others, who had ſeized upon any of the poſſeſſions of the churches or convents, or had heard of any injury that had been committed againſt the

---

ODO, viſcount of *Bourges*, ſold his territory to the king of *France*. *Gallia Chriſtian. Benedictinorum*, tom. ii. p. 45. See for many more examples of this kind CAR. DU FRESNE *Adnot. ad Joinvilli vitam Ludovici S.* p. 52.—BOULAINVILLIER's *Sur l'origine et les droits de la Nobleſſe* in MOLET's *Memoires de Litterature et de l'Hiſtoire*, tom. ix. part. i. p. 68.—JO. GEORGE CRAMER *De juribus et prærogativis Nobilitatis*, tom. i. p. 81. 409. From the commencement therefore of theſe holy wars, a vaſt number of eſtates, belonging to the European nobility, were either mortgaged, or totally transferred, ſome to kings and princes, others to prieſts and monks, and not a few to perſons of a private condition, who, by poſſeſſing conſiderable ſums of ready money, were enabled to make advantageous purchaſes.

[*b*] Such perſons, as entered into theſe expeditions, and were diſtinguiſhed by the badge of the military croſs, acquired thereby certain remarkable rights, which were extremely prejudicial to the reſt of their fellow-citizens. Hence it happened, that when any of theſe *holy* ſoldiers contracted any civil obligations, or entered into conventions of ſale, purchaſe, or any ſuch tranſactions, they were previouſly required to *renounce all privileges and immunities*, which they had obtained or might obtain in time to come by taking on the croſs. See LE BEUF *Memoires ſur l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, *Append.* tom. ii. p. 292.

[(*c*) The tranſlator has here inſerted into the text, the note [*r*] of the original, as it is purely hiſtorical, and makes a very intereſting part of the narration.]

[*d*] See PLESSIS *Hiſt. de Meaux*, tom. ii. p. 76. 79. 141.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. p. 138, 139.—LE BEUF *Memoires pour l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. *Append.* p. 31.—DU FRESNE *Notæ ad Vitam Ludovici Sancti*, p. 52.

clergy, by the remoteſt of their anceſtors, made the moſt liberal reſtitution, both for their own uſurpations and thoſe of their fore-fathers, and made ample ſatisfaction for the real or pretended injuries they had committed againſt the church by rich and coſtly donations [*e*].

Nor were theſe the only unhappy effects of theſe holy expeditions, conſidered with reſpect to their influence upon the ſtate of religion, and the affairs of the Chriſtian church. For while whole legions of biſhops and abbots girded the ſword to their thigh, and went as generals, volunteers, or chaplains into *Paleſtine*, the prieſts and monks, who had lived under their juriſdiction, and were more or leſs awed by their authority, threw off all reſtraint, lived the moſt lawleſs and profligate lives, and abandoned themſelves to all ſorts of licentiouſneſs, committing the moſt flagitious and extravagant exceſſes without reluctance or remorſe. The monſter ſuperſtition, which was already grown to an enormous ſize, received new acceſſions of ſtrength and influence by this holy war, and exerciſed with more vehemence than ever its deſpotic dominion over the minds of the Latins. For the crowd of ſaints, and tutelary patrons, whoſe number was prodigious before this period, was now augmented by fictitious ſaints of Greek and Syrian origin [*f*], which had hitherto been unknown in *Europe*, and an incredible quantity of relics, the greateſt part of which were ridiculous in the higheſt degree, were imported into the European churches. The armies, that returned from *Aſia* after the taking of *Jeruſalem*, brought with them a vaſt number of theſe ſaintly relics, which they bought at a high price from the cunning Greeks and Syrians, and which they conſidered as the nobleſt ſpoils that could crown their return from the holy land. Theſe they committed to the cuſtody of the clergy, in the churches and monaſteries, or ordered them to be moſt carefully preſerved in their families from generation to generation [*g*].

---

[e] DU FRESNE, l. c. p. 52.

[*f*] The Roman catholic hiſtorians acknowledge, that, during the time of the cruſades, many ſaints, unknown to the Latins before that period, were imported into *Europe* from *Greece* and the eaſtern provinces, and were treated with the utmoſt reſpect, and the moſt devout veneration. Among theſe new patrons, there were ſome, whoſe exploits, and even their exiſtence, were called in queſtion. Such among others, was St. CATHARINE, whom BARONIUS and CASSANDER repreſent as having removed from *Syria* into *Europe*. See BARONIUS, *Ad Martyrol. Roman.* p. 728. —GEORGE CASSANDER, *Schol. ad hymnos Eccleſiæ*, p. 278, 279. Opp. *Pariſ.* 1616. *Fol.* It is, however, extremely doubtful, whether or no this CATHARINE, who is honoured as the patroneſs of learned men, ever exiſted.

[*g*] The ſacred treaſures of muſty relics, which the French, Germans, Britons, and other European nations preſerved formerly with ſo much care, and ſhew even in our times with ſuch pious oſtentation, are certainly not more ancient than theſe holy wars, but were then purchaſed at a high rate from the Greeks and Syrians. Theſe cunning traders in ſuperſtition, whoſe avarice and fraud were exceſſive, impoſed upon the credulity of the ſimple and ignorant Latins, and often ſold them fictitious relics. RICHARD, king of *England*, bought, in the year 1191, from the famous SALADIN all the relics that were to be found in *Jeruſalem*, as appears from the teſtimony of MATTHEW DE PARIS *Hiſt. Major*, p. 138. who tells us alſo, p 666. of the ſame work, that the Dominicans brought from *Paleſtine* a white ſtone, in which Jeſus Chriſt had left the print of his feet. The Genoſe pretend to have received from BALDWIN, ſecond king of *Jeruſalem*, the very diſh in which the paſchal lamb was ſerved up to Chriſt and his diſciples at the laſt ſupper; though this famous diſh excites the laughter of even father LABAT, in his *Voyages en Eſpagne et en Italie*, tom. ii. p. 63. For an account of the

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The ſufferings of the church under the dominion and uſurpations of the Saracens and Turks.

I. THE greateſt oppoſition the Chriſtians met with, in this century, was from the Saracens, and Turks. To the latter the Chriſtians and Saracens were equally odious, and felt equally the fatal conſequences of their increaſing dominion. The Saracens, notwithſtanding their bloody conteſts with the Turks which gave them conſtant occupation, and the vigorous, though ineffectual, efforts they were continually making to ſet limits to the power of that fierce nation, which was daily extending the bonds of its empire, perſiſted ſtill in their cruelty towards their Chriſtian ſubjects, whom they robbed, plundered, maimed, or murdered in the moſt barbarous manner, and loaded with all ſorts of injuries and calamities. The Turks, on the other hand, not only reduced the Saracen dominion to very narrow bounds, but alſo ſeized upon the richeſt provinces of the Grecian empire, thoſe fertile countries that lay upon the coaſts of the *Euxine* ſea, and ſubjected them to their yoke, while they impoveriſhed and exhauſted the reſt by perpetual incurſions, and by the moſt ſevere and unmerciful exactions. The Greeks were not able to oppoſe this impetuous torrent of proſperous ambition. Their force was weakened by inteſtine diſcords, and their treaſures were exhauſted to ſuch a degree as rendered them incapable of raiſing new troops, or of paying the armies they had already in their ſervice.

And in the weſtern provinces.

II. The Saracens in *Spain* oppoſed the progreſs of the goſpel in a different, yet ſtill more pernicious, way. They uſed all ſorts of methods to allure the Chriſtians into the profeſſion of mahometaniſm; alliances of marriage, advantageous contracts, flattering rewards were employed to ſeduce them with too much ſucceſs; for great numbers fell into theſe fatal ſnares, and apoſtatized from the truth [*b*]. And theſe allurements would have, undoubtedly, ſtill continued to ſeduce multitudes of Chriſtians from the boſom of the church, had not the face of affairs been changed in *Spain* by the victorious arms of the kings of *Arragon* and *Caſtile*, and more eſpecially FERDINAND I; for theſe princes, whoſe zeal for Chriſtianity was equal to their military

---

prodigious quantity of relics, which St. LOUIS brought from *Paleſtine* into *France*, we refer the reader to the life of that prince compoſed by JOINVILLE, and publiſhed by DU FRESNE; as alſo to PLESSIS *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe de Meaux*, tom. i. p. 120. and LANCELOT *Memoires pour la vie de l'Abbé de St. Cyran*, tom. ii. p. 175. CHRIST's handkerchief, which is worſhiped at *Bezançon*, was brought there from the holy land. See JO. JAC. CHIFLET. *Veſontio*, part. II. p. 108. and *De Linteis Chriſti Sepulchralibus*, c. ix. p. 50.—Many other examples of this miſerable ſuperſtition may be ſeen in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 677.—JO. MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 52. and principally CHIFLET's *Chriſis Hiſtorica de Linteis Chriſti Sepulchralibus*, c. ix, x. p. 50, and alſo 59. where we find the following paſſage: *Sciendum eſt, vigente immani et barbara Turcarum perſecutione et imminente Chriſtianæ religionis in oriente naufragio educta e Sacrariis et per Chriſtianos quovis modo recondita Eccleſiæ pignora . . . . Hiſce plane divinis opibus illecti præ aliis, Sacra λείψανα, qua vi, quo pretio, à detinentibus hac illac extorſerunt.*

[*b*] JO. HENRY HOTTINGERI *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. Sæc.* xi. § ii. p. 452.—MICHAEL GEDDES's *Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Moriſcoes out of Spain* which is to be found in the *Miſcellaneous Tracts of that Author*, tom. i. p. 104.

courage, defeated the Saracens in ſeveral battles, and deprived them of a great part of their territories and poſſeſſions [*i*].

The number of thoſe among the Danes, Hungarians, and other European nations, who retained their prejudices in favour of the idolatrous religion of their anceſtors, was, as yet, very conſiderable; and they perſecuted, with the utmoſt cruelty, the neighbouring nations, and alſo ſuch of their fellow-citizens as had embraced the goſpel. To put a ſtop to this barbarous perſecution, Chriſtian princes exerted their zeal in a terrible manner, proclaiming capital puniſhment againſt all who perſiſted in the worſhip of the Pagan deities. This dreadful ſeverity contributed much more towards the extirpation of paganiſm, than the exhortations and inſtructions of ignorant miſſionaries, who were unacquainted with the true nature of the goſpel, and diſhonoured its pure and holy doctrines by their licentious lives, and their ſuperſtitious practices.

The Pruſſians, Lithuanians, Sclavonians, Obotriti, and ſeveral other nations who dwelt in the lower parts of *Germany*, and lay ſtill groveling in the darkneſs of paganiſm, continued to vex the Chriſtians, who lived in their neighbourhood, by perpetual acts of hoſtility and violence, by frequent incurſions into their territories, and by putting numbers of them to death in the moſt inhuman manner [*k*].

[*i*] For account of theſe wars between the firſt Chriſtian kings of *Spain* and the Mahometans or Moors, ſee the Spaniſh hiſtories of JO. MARIANA and JO. FERRERA.

[*k*] HELMOLDI *Chron. Slavorum*, lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 52.—ADAM. *Bremenſ. Hiſtor.* lib. ii. cap. xxvii.

PART

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. THE declining condition of the Grecian empire was fatal to the progreſs of letters and philoſophy. Its glory and power diminiſhed from day to day under the inſults and uſurpations of the Turks and Saracens; and while the empire ſuffered by theſe attacks from without, it was conſumed gradually by the internal peſtilence of civil diſcord, by frequent ſeditions and conſpiracies, and by thoſe violent revolutions which ſhook from time to time the imperial throne, and were attended with the ſudden fall and elevation of thoſe that held the reins of government [a]. So many foreign invaſions, ſo many internal troubles, ſo many emperors dethroned, deprived the political body of its ſtrength and conſiſtence, broke in upon the public order, rendered all things precarious, and dejecting the ſpirits of the nation, damped the fire of genius, and diſcouraged the efforts of literary ambition. There were, however, ſome emperors, ſuch as ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who ſeemed to cheriſh and encourage the drooping ſciences, and whoſe zeal was ſeconded by ſeveral prelates who were willing to lend a ſupporting hand to the cauſe of letters. The controverſies alſo that ſubſiſted between the Greeks and Latins, obliged the former, amidſt all their diſadvantages, to a certain degree of application to ſtudy, and prevented them from abandoning entirely the culture of the ſciences. And hence it is, that we find among the Greeks of this century ſome writers, at leaſt, who have deſerved well of the republic of letters.

The principal Greek writers.

II. We paſs in ſilence the poets, rhetoricians, and philologiſts of this century, who were neither highly eminent, nor abſolutely contemptible. Among the writers of hiſtory LEO the *grammarian*, JOHN SCYLIZES, CEDRENUS, and a few others deſerve to be mentioned with a certain degree of approbation; notwithſtanding the partiality with which they are chargeable, and the zeal they diſcover for many of the fabulous records of their nation. But the greateſt ornament of the republic of letters at this time, was MICHAEL PSELLUS, a man illuſtrious in every reſpect, and deeply verſed in all the various kinds of erudition, that were known in this age. This great man recommended warmly to his countrymen the ſtudy of philoſophy, and particularly the ſyſtem of ARISTOTLE, which he embelliſhed and

---

[(a) The ſentence which begins with the words *ſo many foreign*, and ends with the words *literary ambition*, is added by the tranſlator to render the connexion with what follows more evident.]

illuſtrated in ſeveral learned and ingenious productions [*b*]. If we turn our eyes towards the Arabians, we ſhall find that they ſtill retained a high degree of zeal for the culture of the ſciences; as appears evidently from the number of phyſicians, mathematicians, and aſtronomers, who flouriſhed among them in this century [*c*].

The ſtate of letters in the weſt.

III. The arts and ſciences ſeemed, in ſome meaſure, to revive in the weſt, among the clergy, at leaſt, and the monaſtic orders; they were not indeed cultivated by any other ſet of men, and the nobility, if we except ſuch of them as were deſigned to fill certain eccleſiaſtical dignities, or had voluntarily devoted themſelves to a religious ſolitude, treated all ſorts of learning and erudition with indifference and contempt. The ſchools of learning flouriſhed in ſeveral parts of *Italy* about the year 1050, and of the Italian doctors, who acquired a name by their writings or their academical leſſons, ſeveral removed afterwards into *France*, and particularly into *Normandy*, where they inſtructed the youth, who had conſecrated themſelves to the ſervice of the church [*d*]. The French alſo, though they acknowledge their obligations to the learned Italians who ſettled in their provinces, yet give us, at the ſame time, a conſiderable liſt of their own countrymen, who, without any foreign ſuccours, cultivated the ſciences, and contributed not a little to the advancement of letters in this century; they mention alſo ſeveral ſchools erected in different parts of that kingdom, which were in the higheſt reputation, both on account of the fame of their maſters, and the multitude of diſciples that reſorted to them [*e*]. And, indeed, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that the liberal arts and ſciences were cultivated in *France*, which abounded with learned men, while the greateſt part of *Italy* lay as yet covered with a thick cloud of ignorance and darkneſs. For ROBERT, king of *France*, ſon and ſucceſſor of HUGH CAPET, diſciple of the famous GERBERT, afterwards SILVESTER II, and the great protector of the ſciences, and friend of the learned, reigned ſo early as the year 1031 [*f*], and exerted upon all occaſions the moſt ardent zeal for the reſtoration of letters, nor were his generous efforts without ſucceſs [*g*]. The provinces of *Sicily*, *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and other ſouthern parts of *Italy* were indebted for the introduction of the ſciences among them, to the Normans, who became their maſters, and who brought with them from *France* the knowledge of letters to a people that ſat benighted in the darkeſt ignorance. To the Normans alſo was due the reſtoration of letters in *England*. WILLIAM, the

---

[b] LEO ALLATIUS *Diatriba de Pſellis*, p. 14. edit. *Fabricii*.

[c] ELMACINI *Hiſtoria Saracen*. p. 281.—JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Sæc.* xi. p. 449.

[d] See MURATORI *Antiquitates Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 871.—GIANNONE *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 148.

[e] *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. at the *Introduction*.—DU BOULAY *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom i. p. 355.—LE BEUF *Diſſ. ſur l'Etat des Sciences en France depuis la mort du Roi Robert*, which is publiſhed among his *Diſſertations ſur l'Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique et Civile de Pariſ.* tom. ii. part. I.

[(*f*) ROBERT died in the year 1031, after a reign of thirty-five years.]

[g] DANIEL *Hiſtoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 58.—DU BOULAY *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 636. *et paſſim*.

Conqueror, a prince of uncommon ſagacity and genius, and the great Mæcenas of his time, upon his acceſſion to the throne of *England* in the year 1066, engaged, by the moſt alluring ſollicitations, a conſiderable number of learned men from *Normandy*, and other countries, to ſettle in his new dominions, and exerted his moſt zealous endeavours to diſpel that ſavage ignorance, that is always a ſource of innumerable evils [*b*]. The reception of Chriſtianity had poliſhed and civilized, in an extraordinary manner, the rugged minds of the valiant Normans; for thoſe fierce warriors, who, under the darkneſs of paganiſm, had manifeſted the utmoſt averſion to all branches of knowledge and every kind of inſtruction, diſtinguiſhed themſelves, after their converſion, by their ardent application to the ſtudy of religion and the purſuit of learning.

Schools opened in ſeveral places.

IV. This vehement deſire of knowledge that increaſed from day to day, and became, at length, the predominant paſſion of the politeſt European nations, produced many happy effects. To it, more particularly, we muſt attribute the conſiderable number of public ſchools that were opened in various places, and the choice of more able and eminent maſters, than thoſe, who had formerly preſided in the ſeminaries of learning. Towards the concluſion of the preceding age, there were no ſchools in *Europe* but thoſe which belonged to monaſteries, or epiſcopal reſidences, nor were there any other maſters, except the Benedictine monks to inſtruct the youth in the principles of ſacred and profane erudition. But not long after the commencement of this century the face of things was totally changed, and that in a manner the moſt advantageous to the cauſe of letters. In many cities of *France* and *Italy*, learned men both among the clergy and laity, undertook the weighty and important charge of inſtructing the youth, and ſucceeded much better in this worthy undertaking, than the monks had done, not only by comprehending in their courſe of inſtruction more branches of knowledge than the monaſtic doctors were acquainted with, but alſo by teaching in a better method and with more perſpicuity and ſucceſs, many of the ſame branches of ſcience, which the others had taught before them. The moſt eminent of theſe new maſters were ſuch as had either traveled into *Spain* with a view to ſtudy in the ſchools of the Saracens (which was extremely cuſtomary in this age among thoſe that were ambitious of a diſtinguiſhed reputation for wiſdom and knowledge) or had improved their ſtock of erudition and philoſophy by a diligent and attentive peruſal of the writings of the Arabians, of which a great number were tranſlated into Latin. For with theſe foreign ſuccours, they were enabled to teach philoſophy, mathematics, phyſic, aſtronomy, and the other ſciences that are connected with them, in a much more learned and ſolid manner, than the monks, or ſuch, as had received their education from them alone. The ſchool of *Salernum*, in the kingdom of *Naples*, was renowned above all others for the ſtudy of phyſic in this century, and vaſt numbers crowded thither

---

[*b*] See *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 171.—*The Engliſh*, ſays MATTHEW PARIS, *were ſo illiterate and ignorant before the time of* WILLIAM *the Conqueror, that a man, who underſtood the principles of grammar, was univerſally looked upon as a prodigy of learning.*

from all the provinces of *Europe* to receive inſtruction in the art of healing: but the medical precepts which rendered the doctors of *Salernum* ſo famous, were all derived from the writings of the Arabians, or from the ſchools of the Saracens in *Spain* and *Africa* [i]. It was alſo from the ſchools and writings of the Arabian ſages, that the abſurd and puerile tricks of divination, and the cuſtom of foretelling future events from the poſition of the ſtars, the features of the face, and the lines of the hand, derived their origin. Theſe ridiculous practices proceeding from ſo reſpectable a ſource, and moreover adapted to ſatisfy the idle curioſity of impatient mortals, were carried on in all the European nations, and in proceſs of time the pretended ſciences of aſtrology and divination acquired the higheſt reputation and authority.

The ſciences that were taught in theſe ſchools.

V. The *ſeven liberal arts*, as they were now ſtiled, were taught in the greateſt part of the ſchools, that were erected in this century for the education of youth. The firſt ſtage of theſe ſciences was grammar, which was followed ſucceſſively by rhetoric, and logic. When the diſciple, having learned theſe three branches, which were generally known by the name of *trivium*, extended his ambition farther, and was deſirous of new improvement in the ſciences, he was conducted ſlowly through the *quadrivium* [k] to the very ſummit of literary fame. But this method of teaching, which had been received in all the weſtern ſchools, was conſiderably changed towards the latter end of this century. For as the ſcience of *logic*, under which *metaphyſics* were in part comprehended, received new degrees of perfection from the deep meditations and the aſſiduous induſtry of certain acute thinkers, and was taught with more detail and ſubtilty than in former times, the greateſt part of the ſtudious youth became ſo enamoured of this branch of philoſophy, as to abandon grammar, rhetoric, and all the other liberal arts, that they might conſecrate their whole time to the diſcuſſion of logical queſtions and the purſuit of metaphyſical ſpeculations. Nor was this ſurprizing, when we conſider, that, according to the opinion which now prevailed in the republic of letters, a man who was well verſed in *dialectics*, i. e. in logical and metaphyſical knowledge, was reputed ſufficiently learned, and was ſuppoſed to ſtand in need of no other branches of erudition [l]. Hence that contempt of languages and eloquence, of the more elegant ſciences, and the finer arts, which ſpred its baneful influence through the Latin provinces; and hence that barbariſm and pedantic ſophiſtry that diſhonoured, in ſucceeding ages, the republic of letters, and corrupted, in a moſt hideous manner, the noble ſimplicity of true theology, and the pureſt ſyſtems of philoſophical wiſdom.

---

[i] Muratori *Antiqq. Ital.* tom. iii. p. 935.—Giannone *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 151.—Freind's *Hiſtory of Phyſic.*—It is well known, that the famous precepts of the ſchool of *Salernum*, for the preſervation of health, were compoſed, in this century, at the requeſt of the king of *England*.

[k] [The *trivium* was a term invented in the times of barbariſm to expreſs the three ſciences that were firſt learned in the ſchools, *viz. Grammar*, *rhetoric*, and *logic*, and the ſchools, in which theſe ſciences alone were taught, were called *triviales*. The *quadrivium* comprehended the four mathematical ſciences, *viz. Arithmetic*, *muſic*, *geometry*, and *aſtronomy*.]

[l] See Boulay *Hiſt. Acad Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 408, 409. 511, 512.—This is too likely to become the prevailing taſte even in our times; but it is an ancient taſte, as we may eaſily perceive by caſting an eye upon the literary hiſtory of the XIth century. And to confirm ſtill farther the truth of that vulgar ſaying, that there is *nothing new under the ſun*, we ſhall quote the following paſſage from the *Metalogicum* of John of *Saliſbury*, a writer of no mean abilities, Lib. i. Cap. iii. p. 741. edit. *Lugdun. Bat.* 1639. *Poetæ, Hiſtoriographi habebantur infames, et ſi quis incumbebat laboribus antiquorum, notabatur ut non modo aſello Arcadiæ tardior, ſed obtuſior plumbo vel lapide, omnibus erat in riſum. Suis enim, aut magiſtri ſui, quiſquis incumbebat inventis.—Fiebant ergo ſummi repente philoſophi:*

Dialectic or logic in high repute.

VI. The philoſophy of the Latins, in this century, was abſolutely confined within the circle of *dialectics*; while the other philoſophical ſciences, were ſcarcely known by name [m]. This *dialectic*, indeed, was miſerably dry and barren, as long as it was drawn from no other ſource than the *ten categories* falſly attributed to St. AUGUSTIN, or from the explications of the Ariſtotelian philoſophy compoſed by PORPHYRY and AVERROES. Theſe, however, were the only guides which the ſchools had to follow in the beginning of this century, nor had the public teachers either genius or courage enough, to enlarge the ſyſtem, or to improve upon the principles, of theſe dictators in philoſophy, whoſe authority was treated as infallible, and their productions, for a long time, regarded as perfect, to the great detriment of true ſcience. But about the year 1050, the face of philoſophy began to change, and the ſcience of logic aſſumed a new aſpect. This revolution began in *France*, where ſeveral of the books of ARISTOTLE had been brought from the ſchools of the Saracens in *Spain*, and it was effected by a ſet of men highly renowned for their abilities, and genius, ſuch as BERENGER, ROSCELLINUS, HILDEBERT, and after them by Gilbert de la Porre, the famous ABELARD, and others. Theſe eminent logicians, though they followed the ſtagirite as their guide, took nevertheleſs the liberty to illuſtrate and model anew his philoſophy, and to extend it far beyond its ancient limits.

VII. The philoſophers of this age, who were moſt famous for their zealous and ſucceſsful endeavours to improve the ſcience of logic and accommodate it to general uſe, were LANFRANC, an Italian by birth, who

---

nam qui illiteratus acceſſerat, fere non morabatur in ſcholis ulterius quam eo cuniculo temporis, quo avium pulli plumeſcunt.—Sed quid docebant novi doctores et qui plus ſomniorum, quam vigiliarum in ſcrutinio philoſophiæ conſumſerant?—Ecce nova fiebant omnia: innovabatur grammatica, immutabatur dialectica, contemnebatur rhetorica, et novas totius quadrivii vias, evacuatis priorum regulis, de ipſius philoſophiæ adytis proferebant. Solam convenientiam, *ſive* rationem *loquebantur, argumentum ſonabat in ore omnium —ac ineptum nimis aut rude et a philoſopho alienum, impoſſibile credebatur* convenienter *et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, niſi* convenientis *et* rationis *mentio expreſſim erat inſerta.* Many more paſſages of this nature are to be found in this author.

[m] We ſhall, indeed, find many, in the records of this century, honoured with the title of *Philoſophers*. Thus we hear of MANEGOLDUS the Philoſopher, ADALARDUS the Philoſopher, &c. But we muſt not attribute to the term *philoſopher*, when applied to theſe grammarians, the ſenſe which it bore among the ancient Greeks and Latins, and which it ſtill bears in our times. In the ſtyle of, what we call, the middle age, every man of learning, of whatever kind his erudition might be, was called a *philoſopher*, and this title was alſo given to the interpreters of ſcripture, though that ſett of men were, generally ſpeaking, deſtitute of true philoſophy. See the *Chronicon Salernitanum* in MURATORI *Scriptor. rerum Italicar.* tom. ii. part. II. cap. cxxiv. p. 265. where we are told, that in the xth century, in which the ſciences were almoſt totally extinguiſhed in *Italy, there were* XXXII *philoſophers at Benevento.* We learn, however, by what follows, that theſe philoſophers were partly grammarians, and partly perſons, who were more or leſs verſed in certain liberal arts.

was abbot of St. STEPHENS at *Caen*, in *Normandy*, and was called from thence by WILLIAM the Conqueror to the ſee of *Canterbury*, ANSELM his ſucceſſor, and ODO, whoſe laſt promotion was the biſhopric of *Cambray*. LANFRANC was ſo deeply verſed in this ſcience, that he was commonly called the *Dialectician*, and he employed with great dexterity the ſubtilties of logic in the controverſy which was carried on between him and the learned BERENGER, againſt whom he maintained the real preſence of CHRIST's body and blood in the holy ſacrament. ANSELM, in a very learned dialogue *De Grammatico*, throws much light upon the darkneſs and perplexity in which the ſcience of logic had lain ſo long involved; and among other things, inveſtigates, with no ſmall ſagacity, the nature of *ſubſtance*, and *mode* or *quality*, in order to convey juſter notions of theſe metaphyſical entities than had been hitherto entertained [*n*]. This great prelate, who ſhone with a diſtinguiſhed luſtre in ſeveral branches of literature both ſacred and profane, was the firſt of the Latin doctors who diſpelled the clouds of ignorance and obſcurity that hung over the important ſciences of *metaphyſic* and *natural theology*, as appears from two books of his compoſition, wherein the truths concerning the deity, which are deducible from the mere light of nature, are enumerated and explained with a degree of ſagacity, which could not well be expected from a writer of this century. He was the inventor of that famous argument, vulgarly and erroneouſly attributed to DESCARTES, which demonſtrates the exiſtence of God from the idea of an infinitely perfect Being naturally implanted in the mind of man, and which is to be found, without exception, in the breaſt of every mortal. The ſolidity of this argument was, indeed, called in queſtion, almoſt as ſoon as it was propoſed, by GAUNILO, a French monk, whoſe objections were anſwered by ANSELM, in a treatiſe profeſſedly written for that purpoſe [*o*]. ODO, the third reſtorer of logic whom we mentioned above, taught that ſcience with the greateſt applauſe, and illuſtrated it in three learned productions, which have not ſurvived the ruins of time [*p*].

[*n*] This dialogue is to be found in the works of ANSELM, publiſhed by father GERBERON, tom. i. p. 143.

[*o*] GAUNILO's Treatiſe is to be found in the works of ANSELM, with the anſwer of that learned prelate. [As ANSELM makes ſuch a ſhining figure in the literary hiſtory of *England*, it will not be improper to add here a more ample account of his character and writings than that which is given by Dr. MOSHEIM. His life and manners were without reproach, though his ſpiritual ambition expoſed him juſtly to cenſure. His works are divided into three parts. The firſt contains his dogmatical tracts, and begins with a diſcourſe concerning the *Exiſtence of God*, the *Divine Attributes*, and the *Trinity*. This diſcourſe is called *Monologia*, becauſe it is drawn up in the form of a ſoliloquy. In this firſt part of the works of ANSELM, there are many curious reſearches upon ſubjects of a very difficult and myſterious nature, ſuch as the *Fall of Satan*, the *Reaſon why God created Man*, the doctrine of *Original Sin*, and the *Manner of its Communication to* ADAM's *Poſterity*, the *Liberty of the Will*, and the *Conſiſtency of Freedom with the Divine Preſcience*. The ſecond and third parts of the writings of this eminent prelate contain his practical and devotional performances, ſuch as *Homilies*, *Poems*, *Prayers*, &c. and his *Letters*, which are divided into four books.]

[*p*] The titles of theſe three treatiſes, are as follow: *De Sophiſta*, *De Complexionibus*, *De re et Ente*. The learned HERIMAN, in his *Narratio reſtaurationis Abbatiæ Sti. Martini Tornacenſis*, which is publiſhed in DACHERIUS's *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. ii. p. 889. ſpeaks of ODO

Diſputes among the logicians. Nominaliſts and Realiſts.

VIII. The reſtoration of logic was immediately followed by a vehement diſpute between its reſtorers and patrons, concerning the *object* of that ſcience; ſuch was the term employed by the contending parties. This controverſy, which was long agitated in the ſchools, was in its nature extremely trivial and unimportant, but conſidered in its conſequences it became a very ſerious and weighty affair, ſince the diſputants on both ſides made uſe of their reſpective opinions in explaining the doctrines of religion, and reciprocally loaded each other with the moſt odious invectives and the moſt opprobrious accuſations. In one point only they were unanimous, acknowledging that *logic* or *dialectic* had for its eſſential *object* the conſideration of *univerſals* in their various relations and points of compariſon, ſince *particular* and individual things, being liable to change, could not be the objects of a ſure and immutable ſcience. But the great queſtion was, whether theſe *univerſals*, which came within the ſphere of logical inquiries, belonged to the claſs of real *things*, or to that of mere *denominations?* One ſet of theſe ſubtile diſputants maintained, that *univerſals* were undoubted *realities* and ſupported their hypotheſis by the authority of PLATO, BOETIUS, and other ancient ſages; the other affirmed, that they were mere *words*, and outward denominations, and pleaded in behalf of their cauſe the reſpectable ſuffrages of ARISTOTLE and PORPHYRY. The former were called Realiſts on account of their doctrine, and the latter Norminaliſts for the ſame reaſon. Each of the contending parties were, in proceſs of time, ſubdivided into various ſects, on account of the different ways in which many explained the doctrine, that was the badge and characteriſtic of their ſect [q]. This controverſy made a prodigious noiſe in all the ſchools throughout *Europe* during many ſucceeding ages, and produced often unhappy contentions and animoſities between philoſophers and divines. Some are of opinion, that it derived its origin from the diſputes, that were carried on between BERENGER, and his adverſaries, concerning the euchariſt [r]; a notion which, though it be advanced without authority, is yet, by no means, deſtitute of probability, ſince the hypotheſis of the Nominaliſts might be very ſucceſsfully employed in

---

in the following honourable manner: *Cum Odo ſeptem liberalium artium eſſet peritus, præcipue tamen in dialectica eminebat, et pro ipſa maxime clericorum frequentia eum expetebat.*

[q] The learned BRUCKER, in his *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iii. p. 904. gives an ample account of the ſect of the Nominaliſts, and enlarges a good deal upon the nature and circumſtances of this logical conteſt; he alſo mentions the various writers, who have made this ſect and its doctrine the object of their reſearches. Among theſe writers, the principal was JOHN SALABERT, preſbyter, in the dioceſe of *Agen*, who publiſhed at *Paris*, in the year 1651, in 8vo. a treatiſe entitled, *Philoſophia Nominalium Vindicata.* This book, which is extremely rare, has been ſeen by none of the authors who have written profeſſedly concerning the ſect of the Nominaliſts. A copy of it, taken from a manuſcript in the French king's library, was communicated to me, from which it appears, that SALABERT, who was certainly a very acute and ingenious logician, employed his labour rather in defending the doctrine of the Nominaliſts, than in giving an accurate account of their ſect. There are, however, ſeveral things to be found in his book, which are far from being generally known, even among the learned.

[r] DU BOULAY *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 443.—GERH. DU BOIS *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 770.

defending the doctrine of BERENGER, concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper.

IX. The ſect of the Nominaliſts had for their chief a certain perſon called JOHN, who, on account of his logical ſubtilty was ſurnamed the *Sophiſt*, which is the only circumſtance we know of his hiſtory [s]. His principal diſciples were ROBERT of *Paris*, ROSCELIN of *Compiegne*, and ARNOUL of *Laon*, who propagated his doctrine with induſtry and ſucceſs, to whom we may add, with ſome probability, RAIMBERT, the maſter of a famous ſchool at *Liſle* in *Flanders*, who is ſaid according to the quibbling humour of the times, to *have red* NOMINAL *logic to his diſciples, while* ODO, whom we have already had occaſion to mention, *inſtructed his ſcholars in* REALITY [t]. Be that as it may, the moſt renowned of all the *nominal* philoſophers of this age was ROSCELIN; and hence it is that many have conſidered him as the chief and founder of that ſect, and that he is ſtill conſidered as ſuch by ſeveral learned men.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. ALL the records of this century loudly complain of the vices that reigned among the rulers of the church, and, in general, among all the ſacerdotal orders; they alſo deplore that univerſal decay of piety and diſcipline, that was the conſequence of this corruption in a ſet of men, who were bound to ſupport by their example, their authority, and their inſtructions, the ſacred intereſts of religion and virtue. The weſtern biſhops, were no ſooner elevated to the rank of dukes, counts, and nobles, and enriched with ample territories, than they gave themſelves up entirely to the dominion of pleaſure and ambition, and, wholly employed in diſplaying the magnificence of their temporal ſtations, frequented the courts of princes accompanied always with a ſplendid train of attendants and domeſtics [u].

---

[s] This account we have from the unknown author of the *Fragmentum Hiſtoriæ Franciæ à Roberto rege ad mortem Philippi* I, which is publiſhed in DU CHESNE'S *Scriptores Hiſtoriæ Francicæ*, tom. iv. p. 90. whoſe words are as follows: *In Dialectica hi potentes extiterunt Sophiſtæ, Johannes, qui artem Sophiſticam vocalem eſſe diſſeruit*, &c.—DU BOULAY (*Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 443 et 612.) conjectures, that this JOHN the Sophiſt was the ſame perſon with JOHN of *Chartres*, ſurnamed the *Deaf*, who was firſt phyſician to HENRY I, king of *France*, and had acquired a high degree of renown by his genius and erudition. The ſame author (p. 377.) tells us, that JOHN had for his maſter, GIRALDUS of *Orleans*, who was an incomparable poet and an excellent rhetorician, but he advances this without any proof. MABILLON, on the other hand, in his *Annal. Benedict.* tom v. lib. lxvii. § lxxviii. p. 261. ſuppoſes, that JOHN the Nominaliſt was the ſame perſon, who made known to ANSELM the error of ROSCELINUS concerning the three perſons in the Godhead.

[t] The paſſage in the original is: *Qui dialecticam clericis ſuis in* VOCE *legebat, quum* ODO *in* RE *diſcipulis legeret*. See HERIMANNUS *Hiſtor. reſtaurationis Monaſterii Sti. Martini Tornacenſ.* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 889.

[u] See among other examples of this epiſcopal grandeur, that of ADALBERT, in ADAM.

The inferior orders of the clergy were alſo licentious in their own way; few among them preſerved any remains of piety and virtue, we might add, of decency and diſcretion. While their rulers were wallowing in luxury, and baſking in the beams of worldly pomp and ſplendor, they were indulging themſelves, without the leaſt ſenſe of ſhame, in fraudulent practices, in impure and laſcivious gratifications, and even in the commiſſion of the moſt flagitious crimes. The Grecian clergy were ſomewhat leſs chargeable with theſe ſhocking irregularities, as the calamities under which their country groaned impoſed a reſtraint upon their paſſions, and gave a check to their licentiouſneſs. Yet, notwithſtanding theſe ſalutary reſtraints, there were few examples of piety and virtue to be found among them.

The authority of the Roman pontifs.

II. The authority and luſtre of the Latin church, or, to ſpeak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontifs, aroſe in this century to their higheſt period, though they aroſe by degrees, and had much oppoſition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the pontifs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious matters, and in every thing that related to the government of the church, and their credit and influence increaſed prodigiouſly towards the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of *maſters of the world*, and *popes*, i. e. *univerſal fathers*; they preſided alſo every where in the councils by their legates; aſſumed the authority of ſupreme arbiters in all controverſies that aroſe concerning religion or church diſcipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church againſt the encroachments and uſurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for on the one hand, it was reſtrained by ſovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and on the other, it was oppoſed by the biſhops themſelves, that it might not ariſe to a ſpiritual deſpotiſm, and utterly deſtroy the liberty and privileges of ſynods and councils [*w*]. From the time of LEO IX, the popes employed every method, which the moſt artful ambition could ſuggeſt, to remove theſe limits, and to render their dominion both deſpotic and univerſal. They not only aſpired to the character of ſupreme legiſlators in the church, to an unlimited juriſdiction over all ſynods and councils whether general or provincial, to the ſole diſtribution of all eccleſiaſtical honours and benefices as divinely authoriſed and appointed for that purpoſe, but they carried their inſolent pretenſions ſo far as to give themſelves out for lords of the univerſe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and ſupreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before LEO IX, no pope was ſo enormouſly impudent as to claim

---

Bremenſ. lib. iii. cap. xxiii. p. 38. lib. iv. cap. xxxv. p. 52. that of GUNTHER, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of CANISIUS, tom. iii. part. I. p. 185. and that of MANASSES, in the *Muſeum Italicum* of MABILLON, tom. i. p. 114. Add to all theſe MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 72.

[*w*] The very learned LAUNOY (in his *Aſſertio contra Privilegium Sti. Medardi*, part. II. cap. xxxi. Opp. tom. iii. part. II. p. 307.) has given us an accurate account of the eccleſiaſtical laws, and of the power of the hierarchy, during this century, which he collected from the letters of pope GREGORY VII; from which account it appears, that GREGORY, ambitious as he was, did not pretend to a ſupreme and deſpotic authority in the church.

this unbounded authority, or to aſſume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their lawful poſſeſſors to new maſters. This pontif gave the example of ſuch an amazing pretenſion to his *holy* ſucceſſors, by granting to the Normans, who had ſettled in *Italy*, the lands and territories which they had already uſurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saracens [*x*]. The ambition, however, of the aſpiring popes was oppoſed by the emperors, the kings of *France*, by William the Conqueror, who was now ſeated on the throne of *England*, and was the boldeſt aſſertor of the rights and privileges of royalty againſt the impudent claims of the apoſtolic ſee [*y*], and alſo by ſeveral other princes. Nor did the biſhops, particularly thoſe of *France* and *Germany*, ſit tamely ſilent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavoured to maintain their rights, and the privileges of the church; but as many, ſeduced by the allurements of intereſt or the dictates of ſuperſtition, ſacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontifs. Hence it happened, that theſe imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, nor ſatisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vaſt augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day.

III. The ſee of *Rome*, after the death of Silvester II, which happened in the year 1003, was filled ſucceſſively by John XVII, John XVIII, and Sergius IV, none of whoſe pontificates were diſtinguiſhed by any memorable events; it is, however, proper to obſerve, that theſe three popes were confirmed in the ſee of *Rome* by the approbation and authority of the emperors, under whoſe reign they were elected to that high dignity. Benedict VIII, who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1012, being obliged by his competitor Gregory to leave *Rome*, fled into *Germany* for ſuccour, and threw himſelf at the feet of Henry II, by whom he was reinſtated in the Apoſtolic chair, which he poſſeſſed in peace until the year 1024. It was during his pontificate, that thoſe famous Normans, who make ſuch a ſhining figure in hiſtory, came into *Italy*, and reduced ſeveral of its richeſt provinces under their dominion. Benedict was ſucceeded by his brother John XIX, who ruled the church until the year 1033. The five pontifs we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with diſhonouring their high ſtation by that licentiouſneſs and immorality that rendered ſo many of their ſucceſſors infamous; their lives were virtuous, at leaſt, their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon BENEDICT IX, a moſt abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the moſt horrid crimes, whoſe flagitious conduct drew upon him the juſt reſentment of the Romans, who, in the year 1038, degraded him from his office. He was afterwards indeed reſtored, by the emperor CONRAD, to the papal chair; but inſtead of learning circumſpection and prudence from his former diſgrace, he grew ſtill more ſcandalous in his life and manners, and ſo provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they depoſed him a ſecond time A. D. 1044, and elected in his place JOHN biſhop of *Sabina*, who aſſumed the name of SYLVESTER III. About three months after this new revolution, the relations and adherents of BENEDICT roſe up in arms, drove SYLVESTER out of the city, and reſtored the degraded pontif to his forfeited honours, which, however, he did not enjoy long; for, perceiving that there was no poſſibility of appeaſing the reſentment of the Romans, he ſold the pontificate to JOHN GRATIAN, arch-preſbyter of *Rome*, who took the name of GREGORY VI. Thus the church had, at the ſame time, two chiefs, SYLVESTER and GREGORY, whoſe rivality was the occaſion of much trouble and confuſion. This conteſt was terminated in the year 1046, in the council held at *Sutri* by the emperor HENRY III, who ſo ordered matters, that BENEDICT, GREGORY, and SYLVESTER were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and SUIDGER, biſhop of *Bamberg*, was raiſed to that dignity, which he enjoyed for a ſhort time under the title of CLEMENT II [z].

[*x*] See Guafr. Malaterra *Hiſt. Sicula*, lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 553. tom. v. *Scriptor. Ital.* Muratorii. [The tranſlator has here incorporated the note [*s*] of the original into the text.]

[*y*] See Eadmeri *Hiſtoria novorum*, lib. i. p. 29. which is publiſhed at the end of the works of Anselm, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. It is proper to obſerve here, that if it is true on the one hand, that William the Conqueror oppoſed, on many occaſions, with the utmoſt vehemence and zeal the growing power of the Roman pontifs, and of the aſpiring biſhops; it is no leſs certain, on the other, that, to accompliſh his ambitious views, he, like many other European princes, had recourſe to the influence of the pontifs upon the minds of the multitude, and thereby nouriſhed and encouraged the pride and ambition of the court of *Rome*. For while he was preparing all things for his expedition into *England*, he ſent ambaſſadors to pope Alexander II, *in order* (as Matthew Paris ſays, *Hiſt. Major*, lib. i. p. 2.) *to have his undertaking approved and juſtified by apoſtolical authority; and the pope, having conſidered the claims of the contending parties, ſent a* standard *to* William *as the omen of his approaching royalty.* It is highly probable, that the Normans in *Italy* had made the ſame humble requeſt to Leo IX, and demanded his confirmation both of the poſſeſſions they had acquired, and of thoſe they deſigned to uſurp. And when we conſider all this, it will not appear ſo ſurprizing that the popes aimed at univerſal empire, ſince they were encouraged to this by the mean ſubmiſſions and ſervile homage of the European princes.

IV. After the death of CLEMENT II, which happened in the year 1047, BENEDICT IX, though twice degraded, aimed anew at the papal dignity, and accordingly forced himſelf into St. PETER's chair for the third time. But the year following he was obliged to ſurrender the pontificate to POPPO, biſhop of *Brixen*, known by the name of DAMASUS II, whom HENRY II elected pope in *Germany*, and ſent from thence into *Italy* to take poſſeſſion of that dignity. Upon the death of DAMASUS, who ruled the ſee of *Rome* but three and twenty days, the ſame emperor, in the diet held at *Worms* A. D. 1048, appointed BRUNO, biſhop of *Toul*, to ſucceed him in the pontificate. This prelate is known in the liſt of the popes by the name of LEO IX, and his private virtues, as well as his public acts of zeal and piety in the government of the church, were deemed meritorious enough to entitle him to a place among the ſaintly order. But if we deduce from theſe pretended virtues his vehement zeal for augmenting the opulence and authority of the church of *Rome*, and his laudable ſeverity in correcting and puniſhing certain enormous vices [a], which were common among the clergy during his pontificate, there will remain little in the life and adminiſtration of this pontif, that could give him any pretenſion to ſuch high diſtinction. It is, at leaſt, certain, that many who induſtriouſly conceal or excuſe the numerous infirmities and failings of the pontifs, cenſure, with the utmoſt freedom, the temerity and injuſtice of the meaſures he took towards the concluſion of his days. Such, among others, was the war which he inconſiderately entered into, in the year 1053, with the Normans, whoſe neighbourhood he did not like, and whom he was grieved to ſee in the poſſeſſion of *Apulia*. His temerity, indeed, was ſeverely puniſhed by the iſſue of this war, from which he derived the bittereſt fruits, being taken priſoner by the enemy, and led captive to *Benevento*. Here diſmal reflexions upon his unhappy fate preyed upon his ſpirits, and threw him into a dangerous fit of ſickneſs; ſo that after a year's impriſonment he was ſent to *Rome*, where he concluded his days on the 19th of *April*, A. D. 1054 [*b*].

---

[z] In this compendious account of the popes, I have followed the relations of FRANCIS and ANTHONY PAGI, PAPEBROCK, and alſo thoſe of MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiæ*, perſuaded that the learned and judicious reader will juſtify my treating with the utmoſt contempt, what BARONIUS and others have alledged in favour of GREGORY VI.

[a] In ſeveral councils, which he aſſembled in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, he propoſed rigorous

V. After the death of LEO the papal chair was filled, in the year 1055, by GEBHARD, biſhop of *Eichſtadt*, who aſſumed the name VICTOR II, and, after governing the church about three years, was ſucceeded by STEPHEN IX, brother to GODFREY, duke of *Lorrain*, who died a few months after his election. Nothing memorable happened under the adminiſtration of theſe two pontifs. GERRARD, biſhop of *Florence*, who obtained the papacy A. D. 1058, and took the name of NICOLAS II, makes a greater figure in hiſtory than ſeveral of his predeceſſors [*c*]. We paſs in ſilence JOHN, biſhop of *Veletri*, who uſurped the pontificate, as alſo the title of BENEDICT X, after the death of STEPHEN, and who was depoſed with ignominy, after having poſſeſſed about nine months the dignity, to which he had no other title, than what he derived from lawleſs violence. NICOLAS, upon the removal of this uſurper, aſſembled a council at *Rome* A. D. 1059, in which, among many ſalutary laws deſigned to heal the inveterate diſorders that had afflicted the church, one remarkable decree was paſſed for changing the ancient form of electing the Roman pontif; this alteration was deſigned to prevent the tumults and commotions which aroſe in *Rome*, and the factions which divided *Italy*, when a new pope was to be elected. The ſame pontif received the homage of the Normans, and ſolemnly created ROBERT GUISCARD, duke of *Apulia*, *Calabria*, and *Sicily*, on condition that he ſhould obſerve, as a faithful vaſſal, an inviolable allegiance to the Roman church, and pay an annual tribute in acknowledgment of his ſubjection to the apoſtolic ſee. By what authority NICOLAS confirmed the Norman prince in the poſſeſſion of theſe provinces, is more than we know; certain it is, that he had no ſort of property in the lands which he granted ſo liberally to the

---

laws againſt ſimony, ſodomy, inceſtuous, and adulterous marriages; the cuſtom of carrying arms that was grown univerſal among the clergy; the apoſtaſy of the monks, who abandoned their habit and renounced their profeſſion, *&c.*]

[*b*] See the *Acta Sanctorum ad d.* xix *Aprilis*, tom. iii. p. 642.—*Hiſt. Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 459.—GIANNONE *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 52.

[*c*] Beſides the accounts given of NICOLAS II, by the writers of the papal hiſtory, there is a particular and accurate hiſtory of this pontif drawn up by the Benedictine monks, in the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 515.

Normans, who held them already by the odious right of conqueſt [d]. Perhaps the lordly pontif founded this right of ceſſion, upon the fictitious donation of CONSTANTINE, which has been already taken notice of in the courſe of this hiſtory; or, probably, ſeduced by the artful and ambitious ſuggeſtions of HILDEBRAND, who had himſelf an eye upon the pontificate, and afterwards filled it, in effect, under the adopted name of GREGORY VII, he imagined that, as CHRIST's vicegerent, the Roman pontif was the king of kings, and had the whole univerſe for his domain. It is well known that HILDEBRAND, had a ſupreme aſcendant in the counſels of NICOLAS, and that the latter neither undertook nor executed any thing without his direction. Be that as it may, it was the feudal grant made to GUISCARD by this pope, that laid the foundation of the kingdom of *Naples*, or of the two *Sicilies*, and of the ſovereignty over that kingdom which the Roman pontifs conſtantly claim, and which the Sicilian monarchs annually acknowledge.

The privileges of the cardinals in the election of the pope.

VI. Before the pontificate of NICOLAS II, the popes were choſen not only by the ſuffrages of the *cardinals*, but alſo by thoſe of the whole Roman clergy, the nobility, the burgeſſes, and the aſſembly of the people. An election, in which ſuch a confuſed and jarring multitude was concerned, could not but produce continual factions, animoſities, and tumults. To prevent theſe, as far as was poſſible, this artful and provident pontif had a law paſſed, by which the *cardinals*, as well preſbyters, as biſhops, were empowered, upon a vacancy in the ſee of *Rome*, to elect a new pope, without any prejudice to the ancient privileges of the Roman emperors in this important matter [e]. Nor were the reſt of the clergy, with the burgeſſes and people, excluded from all in this election, ſince their conſent was ſolemnly demanded, and alſo eſteemed of much weight [f]. In conſequence, however, of this new regulation, the *cardinals* acted the principal part in the creation of the new pontif, though they ſuffered for a long time much oppoſition both from the ſacerdotal orders and the Roman citizens, who were conſtantly either reclaiming their ancient rights, or abuſing the privilege they yet retained of confirming the election of every new pope by their approbation and conſent. In the following century there was an end put to all theſe diſputes by ALEXANDER III, who was ſo lucky as to finiſh and complete what NICOLAS had only begun, and who transfered and confined to the college of *cardinals* the right of electing to the apoſtolic ſee, excluding the nobility, the people, and the reſt of the clergy from all concern in this important matter [g].

---

[d] See MURATORI *Annali d'Italia*, tom. vi. p. 186.—BARONIUS *Annal. ad A.* 1060.

[(e) It does not appear, that NICOLAS was at all ſollicitous about the privileges of the emperor, and his authority in the election of the biſhop of *Rome*; for the words of the decree in all the various copies of it are to this import: "The cardinals ſhall firſt deliberate concerning the election of "a pontif, and the conſent of the other clergy and of the people ſhall be required to confirm their "choice. The pope ſhall be choſen out of the members that compoſe the church of *Rome*, if a proper perſon can be found among them; if not, he ſhall be elected elſewhere. *All this without any* "*prejudice to the honour of our dear ſon* HENRY (*who is now king, and ſhall be ſoon emperor, as we* "*have already promiſed him) or to the honour of his ſucceſſors on whom the apoſtolic ſee ſhall confer per*"*ſonally and ſucceſſively the ſame high privilege.*" Here we ſee the good pontif taking manifeſtly advantage of the minority of HENRY IV, to depreciate and diminiſh the ancient prerogatives of the imperial crown, and to magnify the authority of the papal mitre; for he declares as a *perſonal right* granted by the Roman ſee to each emperor for himſelf, the privilege of confirming the pope's election, whereas it is well known that that privilege had been veſted in the emperors of *Germany* during many preceding ages. See FLEURY *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* vol. xiii. livre lx. p. 64, 65. *Bruſſel's* edition.—It is proper to obſerve here, that the cringing and ignoble ſubmiſſion of CHARLES the Bald, who would not accept of the title of emperor before it was conferred upon him by the Roman pontif, occaſioned, in proceſs of time, that abſurd notion that the papal conſecration was requiſite in order to qualify the kings of *Germany* to aſſume the title of Roman emperors, though, without that conſecration, theſe kings had all *Italy* under their dominion, and exerciſed in every part of it the various rights and prerogatives of ſovereignty. Hence the kings of *Germany* were firſt ſtyled kings of the Franks and Lombards, afterwards kings of the Romans until the year 1508, when MAXIMILIAN I changed the title of *king* into that of *emperor*.]

[f] The decree of NICOLAS concerning the election of the Roman pontif is to be found in many authors, and particularly in the *Concilia*. But upon comparing together ſeveral copies of this

It may not be improper here to give ſome account of the origin of the *cardinals* [h], and the nature of their privileges and functions. Many writers [i] have treated this ſubject in an ample manner, and have ſhed upon it a profuſion of erudition, which deſerves, no doubt, the higheſt applauſe; but they are, generally ſpeaking, defective in perſpicuity and preciſion; nor do I know of any, who have confined themſelves to the true ſtate of the queſtion, and inveſtigated, in a ſatisfactory manner, the true origin of the office of cardinal, and the reaſons that occaſioned the inſtitution of that order of eccleſiaſtics. Several learned men have employed much time and labour in fixing the ſenſe of the word *cardinal*, and in illuſtrating its meaning from ancient monuments and records; but, however worthy of a curious philologiſt theſe reſearches may be, yet they contribute little or nothing to clear up the point in queſtion, or to convey an accurate and ſatisfactory notion of the true origin of the college of cardinals, and the nature of that eccleſiaſtical dignity. It is certain, that the word *cardinal*, when applied to perſons or things, or more eſpecially to the ſacred order, was, according to the language of the middle age, a term of dubious ſignification, and was ſuſceptible of various ſenſes. It is alſo well known, that in former times this title was, by no means, peculiar to the prieſts and

---

famous decree, I found them in many reſpects very different from each other. In ſome copies the decree appears abridged; in others, it is long and prolix. In ſome it ſeems favorable to the rights and privileges of the Roman emperors; in others, it appears to have the contrary tendency. The moſt ample copy is that which we find in the *Chronicon Farfenſe* in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom ii. part. II. p. 645. which differs however, in various circumſtances, from that which is publiſhed by HUGO FLORIACENSIS, in his book *De regia poteſtate et ſacerdotali dignitate*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom iv. p. 62. Notwithſtanding the diverſity that there is in the copies of this famous decree, they all agree in confirming the accounts we have given of the plans and pontificate of NICOLAS.

[g] See MABILLON, *Comm. in Ord. Roman.* tom. ii. *Muſei Italici*, p. 114.—CONSTANT. CENNI *Præf. ad Concilium Lateran. Stephani* iii. p. 18. *Rom.* 1735, in 4^{to}.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 374.

[(h) The tranſlator has here incorporated into the text the long and important note [c] of the original, concerning the *cardinals*. The citations and references only are thrown into the notes.]

[i] The authors who have written concerning the name, origin, and rights of the *cardinals*, are enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* p. 455, 456.—CASP. SAGGITTARIUS *Introd. ad Hiſtoriam Eccleſiaſt.* cap. xxix. p. 771. et JO. ANDR. SCAMIDIUS *in Supplement.* p. 644.—CHRIST. GRYPHIUS *Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Sæculi* xvii. p. 430. add to theſe LUDOV. THOMASSINI *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ vetus et nova*, tom. i. lib. ii cap. 115, 116. p. 616. & LUD. ANT. MURATORI, whoſe learned diſſertation *De origine cardinalatus* is publiſhed in his *Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 156.

miniſters of the church of *Rome*, but was in uſe in all the Latin churches, and that not only the *ſecular* clergy, but alſo the *regular*, ſuch as abbots, canons, and monks, were capable of this nomination, and were ſtiled *cardinals*, though in different ſenſes. But after the pontificate of ALEXANDER III, the common uſe of the term *cardinal* was gradually diminiſhed, and it was confined to ſuch only as were immediately concerned in the election of the pope, and who had the right of ſuffrage in this weighty matter. So that when we inquire into the origin of the college of *cardinals* at *Rome*, the queſtion is not, who they were, that in the remoter periods of the church were diſtinguiſhed, among the Latins in general, or at *Rome* in particular, from the reſt of the clergy, by the name of *cardinals*; nor do we inquire into the proper ſignification of that term, or into the various ſenſes in which it was formerly employed; the true ſtate of the queſtion is this: Who the perſons were that NICOLAS II comprehended under the denomination of *cardinals*, when he veſted in the Roman *cardinals* alone the right of electing the new pontif, and excluded from that important privilege the reſt of the clergy, the nobility, the burgeſſes and the people? When this is known with certainty, then we ſhall have a juſt notion of the *college of cardinals* in its firſt riſe, and ſhall alſo perceive the difference there is between the firſt *cardinals*, and thoſe of our times. Now this may eaſily be learned from the edict of NICOLAS II, which ſets the matter in the cleareſt light. *We have thought proper to enact*, ſays the pontif, *that upon the deceaſe of the biſhop of the Roman catholic or univerſal church, the affair of the election be treated principally and previouſly to all other deliberations, among the* CARDINAL BISHOPS *alone, who ſhall afterwards call in to their council the* CARDINAL CLERKS, *and require finally the conſent of the reſt of the clergy and the people to their election* [*k*]. Here we ſee, that the pontif divides into two claſſes the *cardinals* who were to have the right of ſuffrage in the election of his ſucceſſors, one of which he calls *cardinal biſhops*, and the other *cardinal clerks*. By the former we are manifeſtly to underſtand the ſeven biſhops, who belonged to the city and territory of *Rome*, whom NICOLAS calls, in the ſame edict, *comprovinciales epiſcopi* (an epithet which had been uſed before by LEO I) and who had been diſtinguiſhed by the title of *cardinal biſhops* long before the preſent century. The words of NICOLAS confirm this account of the matter, and place it beyond all poſſibility of contradiction; for he declares, that by *cardinal biſhops* he underſtands thoſe to whom it belonged to conſecrate the pontif elect; *ſince the apoſtolic ſee*, obſerves the papal legiſlator, *cannot be under the juriſdiction of any ſuperior or metropolitan* [*l*], *the* CARDINAL

[(*k*) The paſſage of the edict (which we have here tranſlated from HUGO FLORIACUS in BALUZII *Miſcell.* tom. iv. p. 62.) runs thus in the original: *Conſtituimus ut, obeunte hujus Romanæ univerſalis Eccleſiæ Pontifice, inprimis* CARDINALES EPISCOPI *diligentiſſima ſimul conſideratione tractantes, mox ſibi* CLERICOS CARDINALES *adhibeant, ſicque reliquus Clerus et Populus ad conſenſum novæ electionis accedant*.]

[(*l*) In the conſecration of a new biſhop in any province the metropolitan always bore the principal part; as therefore there was no metropolitan to inſtal the pope, the CARDINAL BISHOPS performed that ceremony.]

BISHOPS *muſt neceſſarily ſupply the place of a metropolitan, and fix the elected pontif on the ſummit of apoſtolic exaltation and empire* [m]. Now it is well known, that the ſeven biſhops of *Rome*, abovementioned, had the privilege of conſecrating the Roman pontif.

All theſe things being duly conſidered, we ſhall immediately perceive the true nature and meaning of the famous edict, according to which it is manifeſt, that, upon the death of a pontif, the CARDINAL BISHOPS were firſt to deliberate *alone* concerning a proper ſucceſſor, and to examine the reſpective merit of the candidates that might pretend to this high dignity, and afterwards to call in the CARDINAL CLERKS, not only to demand their counſel, but alſo to join with them in the election. The word *clerk* here bears the ſame ſenſe with that of *preſbyter*; and it is undeniably certain, that the name of *cardinal preſbyters* was given to the miniſters of the eight and twenty Roman *pariſhes*, or principal churches. All the reſt of the clergy, of whatever order or rank they might be, were, together with the people, expreſly excluded from the right of voting in the election of the pontif, though they were allowed what is called a *negative* ſuffrage, and their conſent was required to what the others had done. From all which it appears, that the college of electors, who choſe the Roman pontif, and who after this period were called *cardinals* in a new and unuſual acceptation of that term, conſiſted, according to their original eſtabliſhment by Nicolas II, of only two orders, namely, *cardinal biſhops* and *cardinal clerks*, or preſbyters [n].

It is neceſſary to obſerve, before we finiſh this digreſſion, that the famous degree of Nicolas could not obtain the force of a law. "It is evident, *ſays* "Anselm, *biſhop of Lucca* [o], that the edict of Nicolas is, and always has "been, without the ſmalleſt degree of weight or authority. But in affirm-"ing this, I have not the leaſt deſign to caſt any reflexion upon the bleſſed "memory of that pontif, or to derogate from the applauſe that is due to his "virtues .... as a man, however, he was fallible, and, through the weak-"neſs that is inſeparable from humanity, was liable to be ſeduced into "meaſures that were inconſiſtent with equity and juſtice." It is true, the prelate has here principally in view that part of the edict in which Nicolas acknowledges and confirms the right of the emperors to ratify the election of the Roman pontif; yet what he ſays is undoubtedly true of the whole edict in all its parts. For the ſeven *palatine judges* [*p*], who were excluded by this decree from the important privilege they had formerly enjoyed of voting in the election to the apoſtolic ſee, complained loudly of the injury that was done them, and, ſeconded in their complaints by the various orders of the clergy, and by the clamours of the army, the citizens, and the multitude, they declared their oppoſition to the execution of this edict, and gave much trouble and uneaſineſs to the *cardinals* who had been conſtituted electors by NICOLAS. To appeaſe theſe tumults, ALEXANDER III augmented the college of the electing *cardinals*, by confering that dignity upon the prior, or arch-preſbyter, of *St. John Lateran*, the arch-preſbyters of *St. Peter's* and *St. Mary Maggiore*, the abbots of *St. Paul's* and *St. Laurence without the wall*, and, laſtly, upon the ſeven *Palatine judges* [*q*]. By this dexterous ſtratagem the higher order of the clergy was defeated, and ceaſed to oppoſe the meaſures of the *cardinal* electors; nor, indeed, could their oppoſition be of any ſignificancy, ſince their chiefs and leaders were become members of the ſacred college inſtituted by NICOLAS. The *inferior clergy* continued yet obſtinate, but their oppoſition was vanquiſhed in the ſame manner, and they were reduced to ſilence by the promotion of their chiefs, the *cardinal deacons*, to the dignity of electors. Who it was, whether ALEXANDER III, or ſome other pontif, that raiſed the principal Roman deacons to the rank of *cardinals*, is not certain; but nothing is more evident than that the deſign of this promotion was to put an end to the murmurs and complaints of the inferior clergy, who reſented highly the violation of their privileges.

---

[m] Such are the ſwelling and bombaſtic terms of the edict. *Quia ſedes apoſtolica ſuper ſe metropolitanum habere non poteſt; cardinales epiſcopi metropolitani vice proculdubio fungantur, qui electum antiſtitem ad apoſtolici culminis apicem provehant.*

[n] We muſt therefore take care that we be not miſled by the error of Onuphr. Panvinius, who affirms, * that the *cardinal biſhops* were not added to the college of cardinals before the pontificate of Alexander III. Nor are we to liſten to the ſuppoſition of thoſe writers, who imagine that certain *deacons* were, from the beginning, members of that college of *cardinals*, by whom the popes were elected. There were, indeed, in the Roman church, long before the edict of Nicolas, and there ſtill remain *cardinal deacons*, i. e. ſuperintendents of thoſe churches which have hoſpitals annexed to them, and whoſe revenues are appropriated to the ſupport of the poor; but they were evidently excluded from the election of the pope, which, by the edict of Nicolas, was to be made by the *cardinal biſhops and clerks* alone. Hence we find the *cardinals* plainly diſtinguiſhed from the deacons in the diploma that was drawn up for the election of Gregory VII to the pontificate.

[o] Anselmi *Luccenſis* lib. ii. *contra* Wibertum *Antipapam, et ſequaces ejus, in* Canisii *Lectionib. Antiquis*, tom. iii. part. I. p. 383.

* See Mabillon, *Comment. in Ordinem Rom.* p. 115. tom. ii. *Muſei Italici.*

When the various orders of the clergy were drawn off from the oppoſition, it was no difficult matter to ſilence the people, and to exclude them from all part in the election of the pontif. And accordingly, when, upon the death of ALEXANDER III, it was propoſed to chooſe LUCIUS III [*r*] as his ſucceſſor, the conſent and approbation of the clergy and people, which had hitherto been always eſteemed neceſſary to ratify the election, were not ſo much as demanded, and the affair was tranſacted by the college of *cardinals* alone, who have continued to maintain that excluſive and important privilege even to our times. Some writers affirm, that INNOCENT II had been elected in the ſame manner, by the *cardinals* alone, without the conſent of the clergy or the people, ſeveral years before the pontificate of LUCIUS [*s*]; this may be true, but it is nothing to the purpoſe; for as the election of INNOCENT II was irregular, it cannot be alledged in the caſe before us.

VII. From what has been obſerved in the preceding ſection we may conclude, that the venerable college of *cardinals*, and the extenſive authority and important privileges they enjoy at this day, derive their origin from the edict publiſhed at the requeſt and under the pontificate of Nicolas II; that, under the title of *cardinals*, this pontif comprehended the ſeven Roman biſhops, who were conſidered as his *ſuffragans*, and of whom the biſhop of *Oſtia* was the chief, as alſo the eight and twenty miniſters, who had inſpection over the principal Roman churches; and that to theſe were added, in proceſs of time under Alexander III and other pontifs, new members, in order to appeaſe the reſentment of thoſe who looked upon themſelves as injured by the edict of Nicolas, and alſo to anſwer other purpoſes of eccleſiaſtical policy. We ſee, alſo, from an attentive view of this matter, that though the high order of purpled prelates, commonly called *cardinals*, had its riſe in the eleventh century, yet it does not ſeem to have acquired the ſtable and undiſputed authority of a legal council before the following age and the pontificate of Alexander III.

[*p*] Theſe judges were the *Primicerius*, *Secundicerius*, *Arcarius*, *Saccellarius*, *Protoſcriniarius*, *Primicerius Defenſorum, et adminiculator*; for a particular account of whoſe reſpective offices, ſervices, and privileges, ſee GRÆVII *Theſaurus Antiquit.* DU CANGE, &c.

[*q*] CENNI *Præf. ad Concil. Lateran. Stephan.* iii. p. 19.—MABILLON, *Comment. ad Ord. Roman.* p 115. *ex Panvinio.*

[(*r*) In the original inſtead of LUCIUS III, we read VICTOR III, which was certainly a miſtake of inadvertency in the learned author.]

[*s*] See PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 615.

VIII. Though Nicolas II had expreſly acknowledged and confirmed in his edict the right of the emperor to ratify by his conſent the election of the pontif; his eyes were no ſooner cloſed, than the Romans, at the inſtigation of Hildebrand, archdeacon, and afterwards biſhop of *Rome*, violated this imperial privilege in the moſt preſumptuous manner. For they not only elected to the pontificate Anselm, biſhop of *Lucca*, who aſſumed the name of Alexander II, but alſo ſolemnly inſtalled him in that high office without ſo much as conſulting the emperor Henry IV, or giving him the leaſt information of the matter. Agnes, the mother of the young emperor, no ſooner received an account of this irregular tranſaction by the biſhops of *Lombardy*, to whom the election of Anselm was extremely diſagreeable, than ſhe aſſembled a council at *Baſil*, and, in order to maintain the authority of her ſon, who was yet a minor, cauſed Cadolaus, biſhop of *Parma*, to be created pontif, under the title of Honorius II. Hence aroſe a long and furious conteſt between the two rival pontifs, who maintained their reſpective pretenſions by the force of arms, and preſented a ſcene of bloodſhed and horror in the church of Christ which was deſigned to be the center of charity and peace. In this violent contention Alexander triumphed, though he could never engage his obſtinate adverſary to deſiſt from his pretenſions [t].

Hildebrand ra
to the pontific

IX. This conteſt, indeed, was of little conſequence when viewed in compariſon with the dreadful commotions which Hildebrand, who ſucceeded Alexander, and aſſumed the name of Gregory VII, excited both in church and ſtate, and nouriſhed and fomented until the end of his days. This vehement pontif, who was a Tuſcan, born of mean parents, roſe, by various ſteps from the obſcure ſtation of a monk of *Cluni*, to the rank of arch-deacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of Leo IX, who treated him with peculiar marks of diſtinction, was accuſtomed to govern the Roman pontifs by his counſels, which had acquired the higheſt degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and the ſame day that ALEXANDER was interred, he was raiſed to the pontificate by the unanimous ſuffrages of the cardinals, biſhops, abbots, monks, and people, and, conſequently, without any regard being paid to the edict of NICOLAS II, and his election was confirmed by the approbation and conſent of HENRY IV, king of the Romans, to whom ambaſſadors had been ſent for that purpoſe. This prince, indeed, had ſoon reaſon to repent of the conſent he had given to an election which became ſo prejudicial to his own authority, ſo fatal to the intereſts and liberties of the church, and ſo detrimental, in general, to the ſovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires [*u*]. HILDEBRAND was a man of uncommon genius, whoſe ambition in forming the moſt arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution; ſagacious, crafty, and intrepid, nothing could eſcape his penetration, defeat his ſtratagems, or daunt his courage; haughty and arrogant beyond all meaſure; obſtinate, impetuous, and intractable; he looked up to the ſummit of univerſal empire with a wiſhful eye, and laboured up the ſteep aſcent with uninterrupted ardor, and invincible perſeverance; void of all principle, and deſtitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he ſuffered little reſtraint in his audacious purſuits from the dictates of religion or the remonſtrances of conſcience. Such was the character of HILDEBRAND, and his conduct was every way ſuitable to it; for no ſooner did he find himſelf in the papal chair, than he diſplayed to the world the moſt odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not contented to enlarge the juriſdiction and to augment the opulence of the ſee of *Rome*, he laboured indefatigably to render the univerſal church ſubject to the deſpotic government, and the arbitrary power of the pontif alone, to diſſolve the juriſdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exerciſed over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from all part in the management or diſtribution of the revenues of the church. Nay, this outrageous pontif went ſtill farther, and impiouſly attempted to ſubmit to his juriſdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to render their dominions tributary to the ſee of *Rome*. Such were the *pious* and *apoſtolic* exploits that employed the activity of GREGORY VII, during his whole life, and which rendered his pontificate, a continued ſcene of tumult, and bloodſhed. Were it neceſſary to bring any farther proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuoſity and boundleſs ambition, we might appeal to thoſe famous *ſentences*, which are generally called after him, the *dictates of Hildebrand*, and which ſhew in a lively manner the ſpirit and character of this reſtleſs pontif [w].

---

[t] Ferdin. Ughelli *Italia Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 166.—Jo. Jac. Mascovius *De rebus imperii ſub Henrico* IV et V, lib. i. p. 7.—Franc. Pagi *Breviar. Pontificum Romanor.* tom ii. p. 385.—Muratori *Annali d'Italia*, tom. vi. p. 214.

[*u*] The writers, who have given the ampleſt accounts of the life and exploits of GREGORY VII, are enumerated by CASP. SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introd. ad Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. i. p. 687. and by AND SCHMIDIUS, in his *Supplement.* tom. ii. p. 627.—See alſo the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. v. *Maii ad d.* xxv. p. 568. and MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ordin. Benedicti Sæcul.* vi. p. 406. Add to theſe *The Life of Gregory* VII, publiſhed at *Francfort* in the year 1710, by JUST. CHRISTOPHER DITHMAR, as alſo the authors, who have written the hiſtory of the conteſts that aroſe between the Empire and the Hierarchy of *Rome*, and of the wars that were occaſioned by the diſpute concerning *Inveſtitures*.

His exploits.

X. Under the pontificate of HILDEBRAND, the face of the Latin church was entirely changed, its government ſubverted, and the moſt important and valuable of thoſe rights and privileges that had been formerly veſted in its councils, biſhops, and ſacred colleges were uſurped by the greedy pontif. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the weight of this tyrannic uſurpation did not fall equally upon all the European provinces; ſeveral of theſe provinces preſerved ſome remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the poſſeſſion of which a variety of circumſtances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we inſinuated above, the views of HILDEBRAND were not confined to the erection of an abſolute and univerſal monarchy in the church; they aimed alſo at the eſtabliſhment of a civil monarchy equally extenſive and deſpotic; and this aſpiring pontif, after having drawn up a ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical canons for the government of the church, would have introduced alſo a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpoſe was to engage in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. PETER, *i. e.* to the Roman pontifs, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to eſtabliſh at *Rome* an annual aſſembly of biſhops, by whom the conteſts that might ariſe between kingdoms or ſovereign ſtates were to be decided, the rights and pretenſions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmeſt oppoſition, particularly from the vigilance and reſolution of the emperors, and alſo from the Britiſh and French monarchs [x].

---

[w] *Dictatus Hildebrandini*. By theſe are underſtood XXVII apothegms, or ſhort ſentences, relating to the ſupreme authority of the Roman pontifs over the univerſal church, and the kingdoms of the world, which are to be found in the 2d book of the Epiſtles of GREGORY VII, between the LV, and the LVIth Epiſtle, under the title of *Dictatus Papæ*, i. e. *Dictates of the Pope*. See HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. vi. part. I. p 1304, and the various writers of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. BARONIUS, LUPUS *, and other hiſtorians, who have ſignalized, upon all occaſions, their vehement attachment to the Roman pontifs, maintain, that theſe *Dictates* were drawn up by GREGORY VII, and propoſed as laws in a certain council; and hence the *Proteſtant* writers have ventured to attribute them to HILDEBRAND. But the learned JOHN LAUNOY, NATALIS ALEXANDER, ANTONY † and FRANCIS PAGI ‡, ELIAS DU PIN, and other authors of note affirm in the moſt poſitive manner that theſe *ſentences*, or *dictates*, were a downright forgery impoſed upon the world under the name of GREGORY by ſome perfidious impoſtor, who propoſed thereby to flatter the Roman pontifs in their ambitious pretenſions. As a proof of this aſſertion they obſerve, that while ſome of theſe *ſentences* expreſs indeed in a lively manner the ambitious ſpirit of GREGORY, there are others which appear entirely oppoſite to the ſentiments of that pontif, as they are delivered in ſeveral parts of his *Epiſtles*. The French writers have important reaſons (which it is not neceſſary to mention here) for affirming that no Roman pontif ever preſumed to ſpeak of the papal power and juriſdiction in ſuch arrogant terms as are here put into the mouth of GREGORY. It may be eaſily granted, that theſe *ſentences*, in their preſent *form*, are not the compoſition of this famous pontif; for many of them are obſcure, and they are all thrown together without the leaſt order, method, or connexion; and it is not to be imagined, that a man of ſuch genius, as GREGORY diſcovered, would have neglected either perſpicuity or preciſion in deſcribing the authority, and fixing, what he looked upon to be, the rights and privileges of the biſhops of *Rome*. But, notwithſtanding all this, if we conſider the *matter* of theſe *ſentences*, we ſhall be entirely perſuaded that they belong originally to HILDEBRAND, ſince we find the greateſt part of them repeated word for word in ſeveral places in his *Epiſtles*, and ſince ſuch of them, as appear inconſiſtent with ſome paſſages in theſe epiſtles, are not ſo in reality, but may be eaſily explained in perfect conformity with what they are ſaid to contradict. The moſt probable account of the matter ſeems to be this: That ſome mean author extracted theſe ſentences, partly from the epiſtles of GREGORY that are yet extant, partly from thoſe that have periſhed in the ruins of time, and publiſhed them in the form in which they now appear, without judgment or method.

* LUPUS, in his *Notæ et Diſſertationes in Concilia*, tom. vi. Opp. p. 164. has given us an ample commentary on the *Dictates of Hildebrand*, which he looks upon as both authentic and ſacred.

† See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*.

‡ See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. ii. p. 473.

That HILDEBRAND laid this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident both from his own epiſtles and alſo from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profeſſion of ſubjection and allegiance [y], ſhews abundantly the arrogance of his pretenſions. But his conduct towards the kingdom of *France* is worthy of particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed was originally derived from the kingdom of *France*, or, which is the ſame thing, from the princes of that nation; and yet HILDEBRAND, or, (as we ſhall hereafter entitle him) GREGORY VII, pretended that the kingdom of *France* was tributary to the ſee of *Rome*, and commanded his legates to demand yearly in the moſt ſolemn manner the payment of that tribute [z]; their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more inſolent than the language in which GREGORY addreſſes himſelf to PHILIP I, king of *France*, to whom he recommends an humble and obliging carriage, from this conſideration that both his *kingdom and his ſoul were under the dominion of* St. PETER (*i. e.* his vicar the Roman pontif) who had *the power* to BIND *and to* LOOSE *him, both in heaven and upon earth* [a]. Nothing eſcaped the all-graſping ambition of GREGORY; he pretended that *Saxony* was a feudal tenure held in ſubjection to the ſee of *Rome*, to which it had been formerly yielded by CHARLEMAGNE as a pious offering to St. PETER. He extended alſo his pretenſions to the kingdom of *Spain*, maintaining, in one of his letters [b], that it was the property of the apoſtolic ſee from the earlieſt times

---

[(x) The long note [g] in the original, which contains the ambitious exploits of HILDEBRAND, is inſerted in the following paragraph, except the citations, which are thrown into notes]

[y] See the ixth book of his Epiſtles, *Epiſt.* iii; the form of the oath runs thus: *Ab hac hora et deinceps fidelis ero per rectam fidem B. Petro Apoſtolo, ejuſque vicario Papæ Gregorio . . . . . et quodcunque ipſe Papa præceperit ſub his videlicet verbis:* PER VERAM OBEDIENTIAM, *fideliter, ſicut oportet Chriſtianum, obſervabo. Et eo die, quando eum primitus videro, fideliter per manus meas miles Sancti Petri et* ILLIUS *efficiat.* What is this elſe than a formal *oath of allegiance?*

[z] *Epiſt.* lib. viii. ep. xxiii. in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. vi. p. 1476. *Dicendum autem eſt omnibus Gallis et per veram obedientiam præcipiendum, ut unaquæque domus ſaltem unum denarium annuatim ſolvat Beato Petro, ſi eum recognoſcant patrem et paſtorem ſuum more antiquo.* Every one knows that the demand that was made with the form, *per veram obedientiam*, was ſuppoſed to oblige indiſpenſably.

[a] Lib. vii. Epiſt. xx. in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, tom. vi. p. 1468. *Maxime enitere ut B. Petrum in cujus poteſtate eſt regnum tuum et anima tua, qui te poteſt in cælo et in terra ligare et abſolvere, tibi facias debitorem.*

[b] Lib. x. ep. vii. *Regnum Hiſpaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuiſſe et ſoli Apoſtolicæ ſedi ex æquo pertinere.*

of the church, yet acknowledging in another [c], that the tranſaction by which the ſucceſſors of St. PETER had acquired this property had been loſt among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more reſpected in *Spain* than they had been in *France*; for it is proved moſt evidently by authentic records, that the king of *Arragon*, and BERNHARD, count of *Beſalu*, gave a favorable anſwer to the demands of GREGORY, and paid him regularly an annual tribute [d]; and their example was followed by other Spaniſh princes, as we could ſhew, were it neceſſary, by a variety of arguments. The deſpotic views of this lordly pontif were attended with leſs ſucceſs in *England*, than in any other country. WILLIAM the Conqueror was a prince of great ſpirit and reſolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a ſovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly when GREGORY wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter-pence* [e], and at the ſame time ſummoning him to do homage for the kingdom of *England* as a fief of the apoſtolic ſee, WILLIAM granted the former, but refuſed the latter [f] with a noble obſtinacy, declaring that he held his kingdom of God only and his own ſword. Obliged to yield to the obſtinacy of the Engliſh monarch, whoſe name ſtruck terror into the boldeſt hearts, the reſtleſs pontif addreſſed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to all the moſt powerful German princes [g], to GEUSA king of *Hungary* [h], and SUENO, or SWEIN, king of *Denmark* [i], ſolliciting them to make a ſolemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apoſtles, and to hold them under the juriſdiction of his vicar at *Rome*, as fiefs of the apoſtolic ſee. What ſucceſs attended his demands upon theſe princes, we cannot ſay; but certain it is, that in ſeveral places his efforts were effectual, and his *modeſt* propoſals were received with the utmoſt docility and zeal. The ſon of DEMETRIUS, king of the *Ruſſians*, ſet out for *Rome*, in conſequence of the pontif's letter [*k*], in order to *obtain as a gift from St.* PETER *by the hands of* GREGORY, *after profeſſing his ſubjection and allegiance to the prince of the apoſtles, the kingdom* which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious requeſt* was readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. DEMETRIUS SUINIMER, duke of *Croatia* and *Dalmatia*, was raiſed to the rank and prerogatives of royalty by the ſame pontif in the year 1076, and ſolemnly proclaimed king by his legate at *Salona*, upon condition that he ſhould pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. PETER at every Eaſter feſtival [*l*]. This bold ſtep was injurious to the authority of the emperors of *Conſtantinople*, who, before this time, comprehended the province of *Croatia* within the limits of their ſovereignty. The kingdom of *Poland* became alſo the object of GREGORY's ambition, and a favorable occaſion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views; for BASILAUS II, having aſſaſſinated STANISLAUS biſhop of *Cracow*, the pontif not only excommunicated him with all the circumſtances of infamy that he could invent, but alſo pulled him from his throne, diſſolved the oath of allegiance which his ſubjects had taken, and, by an expreſs and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of *Poland* from electing a new king without the conſent of the Roman pontif [*m*]. Many more examples might be alledged of the phrenetic ambition of GREGORY, but thoſe which have been already mentioned are ſufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the ſucceſs of that pontif been equal to the extent of his inſolent views, all the kingdoms of *Europe* would have been this day tributary to the Roman ſee, and its princes the ſoldiers or vaſſals of St. PETER, in the perſon of his pretended vicar upon earth. But though his moſt important projects were ineffectual, yet many of his attempts were crowned with a favorable iſſue; for from the time of his pontificate the face of *Europe* underwent a conſiderable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other ſovereign princes, were much diminiſhed. It was, particularly, under the adminiſtration of GREGORY, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their conſent, the election of the Roman pontif, a privilege of no ſmall importance, and which as yet they have never recovered.

---

[c] Lib. x. epiſt. xxviii.

[d] See PETRUS DE MARCA *Hiſtoire de Bearn*, lib. iv. p. 331, 332.

[(e) *Peter-pence* (ſo called from its being collected on the feſtival of *St. Peter in Vinculis*) was an ancient tax of a penny on each houſe, firſt granted, in the year 725, by INA, king of the Weſt-Saxons, for the eſtabliſhment and ſupport of an Engliſh college at *Rome*, and afterwards extended, in the year 794, by OFFA over all *Mercia* and *Eaſt-Anglia*. In proceſs of time it became a ſtanding and general tax throughout all *England*, and, though it was for ſome time applied to the ſupport of the Engliſh college according to its original deſign, the popes found means to appropriate it to themſelves. It was confirmed by the laws of CANUTE, EDWARD the Confeſſor, WILLIAM the Conqueror, *&c.* and was never totally aboliſhed till the reign of HENRY VIII.]

[f] The letter of WILLIAM is extant in the *Miſcellanea* of BALUZIUS, tom. vii. p. 127. as alſo in COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, in the *Collection of Records*, at the end of the firſt volume, p. 713. N° 12. *Hubertus legatus tuus* (ſays the reſolute monarch to the audacious pontif) *admonuit me, quatenus tibi et ſucceſſoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecunia, quam anteceſſores mei ad eccleſiam mittere ſolebant, melius cogitarem. Unum admiſi, alterum non admiſi.* FIDELITATEM FACERE, NOLUI, NEC VOLO, &c.

[g] See in HARDUIN's *Concilia*, his famous letter (lib. ix. epiſt. iii.) to the biſhop of *Padua*, exhorting him to engage WELPHO, duke of *Bavaria*, and other German princes, to ſubmit themſelves and their dominions to the apoſtolic juriſdiction. *Admonere te volumus* (ſays the pontif) *Ducem Welphonem, ut fidelitatem B. Petro faciat . . . Illum enim totum in gremio Beati Petri collocare deſideramus et ad ejus ſervitium ſpecialiter provocare. Quam voluntatem ſi in eo, vel etiam in aliis potentibus viris amore B. Petri ductis cognoveris, ut perficiant elabora.*

[h] Lib. ii. ep. lxx.

[i] Lib. ii. ep. li.

XI. The zeal and activity which GREGORY employed in extending the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee, and enriching the patrimony of St. PETER, met, no where, with ſuch remarkable ſucceſs as in *Italy*. His intimate familiarity with MATHILDA, the daughter of BONIFACE duke of *Tuſcany*, and the moſt powerful and opulent princeſs in that country (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguiſhed the tender paſſions in the heart of Gregory) contributed much to this ſucceſs; for he engaged that princeſs, after the death of her huſband Godfrey, duke of *Lorrain*, and her mother Beatrix, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to ſettle all her poſſeſſions in *Italy* and elſewhere upon the church of *Rome*, and thus to appoint St. Peter and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immenſe treaſures. This rich donation was, indeed, conſiderably invalidated by the ſecond marriage, which Mathilda contracted, in the year 1089, with Welph, or Guelph, ſon of the duke of *Bavaria*, and that, with the conſent of the Roman pontif Urban II. She, however, renewed it in a ſolemn manner in the year 1102, about ſeven years after her ſeparation from her ſecond huſband, by which ſhe became again ſole miſtreſs of her vaſt poſſeſſion [n]. But notwithſtanding this new act, the Roman pontifs did not remain in the peaceful poſſeſſion of this ſplendid inheritance. It was warmly and powerful diſputed, firſt by the emperor Henry V, and afterwards by ſeveral other princes; nor were the pontifs ſo ſucceſsful in this conteſt as to preſerve the whole inheritance, though, after various ſtruggles and efforts, they remained in the poſſeſſion of a conſiderable part of it, which they ſtill enjoy [o].

[*k*] Lib. ii. ep. lxxiv.

[*l*] See DU MONT *Corps Diplomatique*, tom. i. part. I. *n.* 88. p. 53.—JO. LUCIUS *De regno Dalmatiæ*, lib. ii. p. 85.

[*m*] See DLUGOSSI *Hiſtor. Polon.* tom. i. p. 295.

The decrees of Gregory VII.

XII. The plan that Gregory had formed for raiſing the church above all human authority to a ſtate of perfect ſupremacy and independence, had many kinds of oppoſition to encounter, but none more unſurmountable than that which aroſe from the two reigning vices of *concubinage* and *ſimony*, that had infected the whole body of the European clergy. The Roman pontifs, from the time of Stephen IX, had combated, with zeal and vehemence, theſe monſtrous vices [*p*], but without ſucceſs, as they were become too inveterate and too univerſal to be extirpated without the greateſt difficulty and the moſt extraordinary efforts. Accordingly GREGORY, in the year 1074,

---

[n] The life and exploits of this heroic princeſs (who was one of the ſtrongeſt bulwarks of the Roman church againſt the power of the emperors, and the moſt tender and obedient of all the *ſpiritual* daughters of Gregory VII) has been written by Bened. Luchinus, Domin. Mellinus, Felix Contelorius, Julius de Puteo, but more amply by Francis Maria Florent. in his *Records concerning the counteſs Mathilda*, wrote in Italian, and Bened. Bachinius, in his *Hiſtoria Monaſterii Podalironenſis*. The famous Leibnitz, in his *Scriptores Brunſvic.* tom. i. p. 629. and Lud. Ant. Muratori, in his *Scriptores rerum Italic.* tom. v p. 335. have publiſhed, with annotations, the ancient hiſtories of the life of Mathilda, compoſed by Donizo, and another writer whoſe name is unknown, together with the copy of the ſecond act of ceſſion by which that princeſs confirmed her former grant to the church of *Rome*. We may add here, that nothing relating to this extraordinary woman is more worthy of peruſal than the accounts that we find of her, and her ſecond huſband, in the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. v. p. 444. et tom. ii. lib. vi. cap. iii. p. 303.

[o] Many learned men conclude from the very Act by which this *donation* was confirmed to the ſee of *Rome*, that Mathilda, comprehended in this donation only her *allodial* poſſeſſions, and not the territories which ſhe held as *fiefs of the empire*, ſuch as the marquiſate of *Tuſcany*, and the dutchy of *Spoleto*. For the words of the act run thus: *Ego Mathildis . . . dedi et obtuli eccleſiæ S. Petri . . . omnia mea bona* jure proprietario, *tam quæ tunc habueram, quam ea, quæ in antea acquiſitura eram, ſive jure ſucceſſionis, ſive alio quocunque jure ad me pertinent.* See the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. p. 448. But it is much to be queſtioned, whether this diſtinction is ſo evident, as is pretended. For the words jure proprietario, from which it is inferred, that Mathilda diſpoſed of only her *allodial* poſſeſſions in favour of St. Peter, don't, in my opinion, relate to the poſſeſſions of the teſtatrix, but to the nature of the gift, and muſt be interpreted in conjunction with the preceding verbs, *dedi et obtuli*. For the princeſs does not ſay, *dedi omnia bona, quæ* jure proprietario *poſſideo et habeo*, i e. *I have granted that part of my property which I hold by a ſupreme and independent right*, in which caſe the opinion of the learned men abovementioned would be well founded, but ſhe ſays, *dedi omnia bona mea eccleſiæ* jure proprietario, i. e. *my will is, that the*

---

church ſhauld poſſeſs as its own property the inheritance I have left it. Beſides, the following words manifeſtly ſhew, that the opinion of theſe learned men is deſtitute of all foundation; ſince MATHILDA could not poſſibly add, *ſive jure ſucceſſionis, ſive* ALIO QUOCUNQUE JURE *ad me pertineant,* i. e. *I grant all my poſſeſſions under whatever title I enjoy them, whether by right of ſucceſſion, or by* ANY OTHER RIGHT, &c. had ſhe deſigned to confine her donation to her *allodial* poſſeſſions. Certain it is, that in this ample grant ſhe excepts no particular part of her property, but evidently comprehends in it her whole ſubſtance. If it be objected to this, that the Roman pontifs never affirmed that the *fiefs of the empire,* which MATHILDA poſſeſſed, were comprehended in this grant to their church, and that they only claimed her *allodial* and independent poſſeſſions; I anſwer, by queſtioning the fact, ſince many circumſtances concur to prove, that theſe pontifs claimed the whole ſubſtance of MATHILDA, all her poſſeſſions without exception, as their undoubted right. But ſuppoſe for a moment, that the caſe was otherwiſe, and that the Roman church had never made ſuch an univerſal claim, this would, by no means, invalidate the opinion I here maintain; ſince the queſtion, under conſideration, is not, how far the Roman pontifs may have moderated their pretenſions to the territories of MATHILDA, but what is the true and genuine ſenſe of the words in which her donation is expreſſed.

[*p*] *Monſtrous vices* we may juſtly call them. For though it be true, that in the methods GREGORY took to extirpate theſe vices, he violated not only the laws of religion, but alſo the dictates of natural equity and juſtice, and, under the maſk of a pious zeal, committed the moſt crying and abominable enormities; yet it is certain, on the other hand, that theſe vices produced the moſt unhappy effects both in church and ſtate, and that the ſuppreſſion of them was now become abſolutely neceſſary. There were indeed, among the clergy, ſeveral men of piety and virtue who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and theſe GREGORY ought to have ſpared. But there was alſo a prodigious number of eccleſiaſtics throughout *Europe*, not only of prieſts and canons, but alſo of monks, who lived in the bonds of a criminal love, kept, under the title of wives, miſtreſſes which they diſmiſſed, at pleaſure, to enjoy the ſweets of a licentious variety, and who not only ſpent, in the moſt profuſe and ſcandalous manner, the revenues and treaſures of the churches and convents to which they belonged, but even diſtributed a great part of them among their baſtards. As to the vice of *ſimony*, its univerſal extent and its pernicious fruits appear evidently from thoſe records, which the Benedictine monks have publiſhed in ſeveral places of their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, not to mention a multitude of other ancient papers to the ſame purpoſe. One or two examples will be ſufficient to give the reader an idea of this matter. We find in the firſt volume of the admirable work now mentioned (in the *Append. Document.* p. 5.) a public act, by which BERNARD a viſcount, and FROTERIUS biſhop of *Alby*, grant, or rather ſell, openly to BERNARD AIMARD and his ſon the biſhopric of *Alby*, reſerving to themſelves a conſiderable part of its revenues. This act is followed by another, in which count PONTIUS bequeaths to his wife the ſame biſhopric of *Alby* in the following terms: *Ego Pontius dono tibi dilectæ ſponſæ meæ epiſcopatum Albienſem — cum ipſa eccleſia et cum omni adjacentia ſua — et medietatem de epiſcopatu Nemauſo — et medietatem de abbatia Sti. Ægidii — poſt obitum tuum remaneat ipſius alodis ad infantes qui de me erunt creati.* In the ſecond volume of the ſame learned work (in the *Append. Document.* p. 173.) there is a letter of the *clergy of Limoges*, beſeeching WILLIAM, count of *Aquitain*, not to ſell the biſhopric, but to give them a paſtor, and not a devourer of the flock. *Rogamus tuam pietatem, ne propter mundiale lucrum vendas Sti. Stephani locum, quia ſi tu vendis epiſcopalia, ipſe noſtra manducabit communia — Mitte nobis ovium cuſtodem, non devoratorem.* ADEMAR, viſcount of *Limoges*, laments (tom. ii. p. 179.) that *he himſelf had formerly made traffic of the cure of ſouls by ſelling benefices to ſimoniacal abbots.* The barefaced impudence of the ſacerdotal orders in buying and ſelling benefices, exceeded all meaſure, and almoſt all credibility. And they carried matters ſo far as to juſtify that abominable traffic, as may be ſeen in a remarkable paſſage in the *Apologeticum* of ABBO, which is added, by PITHOU, to the *Codex Can. Eccleſiæ Romanæ*; this paſſage, which deſerves to be quoted, is as follows: *Nihil pœne ad eccleſiam pertinere videtur, quod ad pretium non largiatur, ſcilicet epiſcopatus, preſbyteratus, diaconatus, et aliqui minores gradus, archidiaconatus quoque, decania, præpoſitura, theſauri cuſtodia, baptiſterium — et hujuſmodi negociatores ſubdola reſponſione ſolent aſtruere, non ſe emere denedictionem, quâ percipitur gratia ſpiritus ſancti, ſed res eccleſiarum vel poſſeſſiones epiſcopi.* An acute diſtinction truly!

which was the ſecond of his pontificate, exerted himſelf with much more vigour than his predeceſſors had done in oppoſition to the vices already mentioned. For this purpoſe he aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which all the laws of the former pontifs againſt *ſimony* were renewed and confirmed, and the buying or ſelling eccleſiaſtical benefices prohibited in the ſtricteſt and ſevereſt manner. It was alſo decreed in the ſame council, that the ſacerdotal orders ſhould abſtain from marriage, and that ſuch of them as had already wives, or concubines, ſhould immediately diſmiſs them, or quit the prieſtly office. Theſe decrees were accompanied with circular letters wrote by the pontif to all the European biſhops, enjoining the ſtricteſt obedience to the deciſions of this ſolemn council, under the ſevereſt penalties. GREGORY did not ſtop here, but ſent ambaſſadors into *Germany* to HENRY IV, king of the Romans, in order to engage that prince to ſummon a council for the trial and puniſhment of ſuch eccleſiaſtics, as had been hitherto guilty of ſimoniacal practices.

The ſevere proceedings of the pontif againſt concubinage produce much trouble.

XIII. Theſe decrees, which were in part equitable and juſt, and which were, in every reſpect, conformable with the notions of religion that prevailed in this age, were looked upon by the people as highly ſalutary, ſince they rendered a free election, and not a mercenary purchaſe, the way to eccleſiaſtical promotion, and obliged the prieſts to abſtain from marriage, which was abſurdly conſidered as inconſiſtent with the ſanctity of their office. Yet both theſe decrees were attended with the moſt deplorable tumults and diſſenſions, and were fruitful, in their conſequences, of innumerable calamities. No ſooner was the law concerning the *Celibacy of the Clergy* publiſhed, than the prieſts, in the ſeveral provinces of *Europe*, who lived in the bonds of marriage with lawful wives, or of laſcivouſneſs with hired concubines [q], complained loudly of the ſeverity of this council, and excited the moſt dreadful tumults in the greateſt part of the European provinces. Many of theſe eccleſiaſtics, eſpecially the Milaneſe prieſts, choſe rather to abandon their ſpiritual dignities than their ſenſual pleaſures, and to quit their benefices that they might cleave to their wives. They went ſtill farther: for they ſeparated themſelves entirely from the church of *Rome*, and branded with the infamous name of *Paterini* [r], i. e. Manichæans, the pontif and his adherents who condemned ſo unjuſtly the conduct of ſuch prieſts as entered into the bonds of a lawful and virtuous wedlock. The proceedings of GREGORY appeared to the wiſer part even of thoſe who approved of the celibacy of the clergy, unjuſt and criminal in two reſpects: Firſt, in that his ſeverity fell indiſcriminately and with equal fury upon the virtuous huſband, and the licentious rake, and that he diſſolved, with a mercileſs hand, the chaſteſt bonds of wedlock, and thus involved huſbands and wives with their tender offſpring in diſgrace, perplexity, anguiſh, and want [*s*]. The ſecond thing criminal in the meaſures taken by this pontif was, that inſtead of chaſtiſing the married prieſts with wiſdom and moderation, and according to the laws of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, whoſe nature is wholly ſpiritual, he gave them over to the civil magiſtrate to be puniſhed as diſobedient and unworthy ſubjects with the loſs of their ſubſtance, and with the moſt ſhocking marks of undeſerved infamy and diſgrace [*t*].

---

[q] All the hiſtorians, who give any accounts of this century, mention the tumults excited by ſuch rieſts, as were reſolved to continue with their wives or concubines. For an account of the ſeditions hich aroſe in *Germany* upon this occaſion, ſee SIGONIUS *De Regno Italiæ*, lib. ix. p. 557. tom. ii. s alſo TENGNAGEL's *Collectio Veter. Monument.* p. 45. 47. 54. Thoſe that the prieſts excited in *ngland* are mentioned by M. PARIS, in his *Hiſtor. Major*, lib. i. p. 7. The tumults occaſioned y the ſame reaſon in the Belgic and Gallic provinces, are deſcribed in the *Epiſtola Clericorum ameracenſium ad Remenſes pro uxoribus ſuis*, publiſhed in MABILLON's *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. v. . 634. and in the *Epiſtola Noviomenſium Clericorum ad Cameracenſes*, publiſhed in MABILLON's *uſeum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 128. Great was the flame which the laws of GREGORY excited in *aly*, and particularly in the province of *Milan*, of which we have an ample relation given by RNULPH and LANDULPH, two Milaneſe hiſtorians, whoſe works are publiſhed, with annotations, y MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iv. p. 36. Both theſe hiſtorians maintain gainſt GREGORY and his ſucceſſors the cauſe of the injured prieſts, and the lawfulneſs of their arriages.

[r] *Paterinus* is one of the names by which the Paulicians or Manichæans (who came during this ntury from *Bulgaria* into *Italy*, and were alſo known by the title of *Cathari* or *Pure*) were diſtin-

---

guiſhed among the Italians. But in proceſs of time the term *Paterinus* became a common name for all kinds of heretics, as we might ſhew by many examples taken from the writers of the XII and XIIIth centuries. There are various opinions concerning the origin of this word, the moſt probable of which is that which ſuppoſes it derived from a certain place called *Pataria*, in which the heretics held their aſſemblies; and it is well known, that a part of the city of *Milan* is, to this very day, called *Pattaria*, or *Contrada de Patarri*. See *Adnotat. ad Arnulphum Mediolanenſ.* in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italicar.* tom. iv. p. 39. ſee alſo SAXIUS *ad Sigonium de Regno Italiæ*, lib. ix. p. 536. tom. ii. Opp. *Sigonii*. An opinion (of which, if I am not miſtaken, SIGONIUS was the author) prevailed, that the name in queſtion was given to the Milaneſe prieſts, who ſeparated from the church of *Rome*, and retained their wives in oppoſition to the laws of the pontifs. But this opinion is without foundation; and it appears evidently from the teſtimony of ARNULPH and other hiſtorians, that it was not the married prieſts, but the faction of the pontifs, who condemned their conjugal bonds, that were branded with the opprobrious name of *Patarini*. See ARNULPH. lib iii. c. x.—ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Annal. Baron.* tom. iii. *ad A.* 1057. § iii.—LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 82. who have demonſtrated this in the moſt ample, learned, and ſatisfactory manner. Nor need we, indeed, look any where elſe for the origin of this word. It is abundantly known, that the Manichæans, and their brethren the Paulicians, were extremely averſe to marriage, which they looked upon as an inſtitution invented by the *evil principle*; they, of conſequence, who conſidered the marriages of the clergy as lawful, employed the ignominious name of *Paterini*, to ſhew that the pontifs, who prohibited theſe marriages, were followers of the odious doctrine of the Manichæans.

[*s*] We muſt always remember that the prieſts, to whom their wives or miſtreſſes were much dearer than the laws of the pontifs, were not all of the ſame character; nor were ſuch of them as might be juſtly eſteemed criminal, all criminal in the ſame degree. The better ſort of theſe eccleſiaſtics (among which we may count the Belgic and Milaneſe clergy) deſired nothing more than to live after the manner of the Greeks, maintaining that it was lawful for a prieſt, before his conſecration, to marry one virgin, though a plurality of wives was juſtly prohibited; and they grounded this their opinion upon the authority of St. AMBROSE. See JO. PETRI PURICELLI *Diſſertatio utrum S. Ambroſius clero ſuo Mediolan. permiſerit, ut virgini ſemel nubere poſſent*, republiſhed by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores Italic.* tom. iv. p. 123. GREGORY and his ſucceſſors ought to have dealt more gently with this kind of eccleſiaſtics (as the warmeſt admirers of the pontifs acknowledge) than with thoſe prieſts, who were either the patrons of concubinage, or who pretended to juſtify their eſpouſing a plurality of wives. It was alſo unjuſt to treat, in the ſame manner, the monks, who, by the nature of their profeſſion and vows, were neceſſarily excluded from the nuptial ſtate; and the prieſts, who could not bear the thoughts of being torn from the chaſte partners of their bed, whom they had eſpouſed with virtuous ſentiments and upright intentions, nor from the tender offſpring which were the fruit of virtuous love.

[*t*] THEODORICUS, *Verdun. Epiſtola ad Gregorium* VII, *in Martene Theſauro Anecdotorum*, tom. i. p. 218.—*Faciem meam in eo vel maxime confuſione perfundunt, quod legem de Clericorum Incontinentia*

The diſpute concerning inveſtitures occaſioned by the laws againſt ſimony.

XIV. This vehement conteſt excited great tumults and diviſions, which, however, were gradually calmed through length of time, and alſo by the perſeverance of the obſtinate pontif; nor did any of the European kings and princes concern themſelves ſo much about the marriages of the clergy as to maintain their cauſe, and thereby to prolong the controverſy. But the troubles that aroſe from the law that regarded the extirpation of *ſimony* were not ſo eaſily appeaſed; the tumults it occaſioned grew greater from day to day; the methods of reconciliation more difficult; and it involved both ſtate and church during ſeveral years in the deepeſt calamities and in the moſt complicated ſcenes of confuſion and diſtreſs [*u*]. HENRY IV received, indeed, graciouſly the legates of GREGORY, and applauded his zeal for the extirpation of *ſimony*; but neither this prince, nor the German biſhops, would permit theſe legates to aſſemble a council in *Germany*, or to proceed judicially againſt thoſe, who, in time paſt, had been chargeable with ſimoniacal practices. The pontif, exaſperated at this reſtraint in the execution of his deſigns, called another council to meet at *Rome* in the year 1075, in which he purſued his adventurous project with greater impetuoſity and vehemence than ever; for he not only excluded from the communion of the church ſeveral German and Italian biſhops and certain favorites of HENRY, whoſe counſels that prince was ſaid to make uſe of in the traffic of eccleſiaſtical dignities, but alſo pronounced, in a formal edict, *Anathema againſt whoever received the inveſtiture of a biſhopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, as alſo againſt*

PER LAICORUM INSANIAS *cohibenda unquam ſuſceperim.—Nec putetis eos qui ita ſentiunt . . . eccleſiaſticorum graduum incontinentiam talibus defenſionibus fovere velle. Honeſtam converſationem in deſiderio habent, nec aliter, quam oportet,* ECCLESIASTICÆ ULTIONIS CENSURAM *intentari gaudent.*

[*u*] We have extant a great number both of ancient and modern writers, who have related the circumſtances of this diſpute concerning *inveſtitures*, which was begun by GREGORY VII, was carried on by him and his ſucceſſors on the one ſide, and the emperors HENRY IV and V on the other, and became a ſource of innumerable calamities to the greateſt part of *Europe*. But few or none of theſe writers have treated this weighty ſubject with an entire impartiality. They all plead either the cauſe of the pontifs, or that of the emperors, and decide the controverſy, not by the laws then in being (which ought, no doubt, to be principally conſulted) nor by the opinions that generally prevailed at the time of this conteſt, but by laws of their own invention, and by the opinions of modern times. The famous GRETSER, in his *Apologia pro Gregorio* VII, which is publiſhed in the 6th volume of his works, and alſo ſeparately, has collected the principal of the ancient writers who maintain the cauſe of the pontif; in oppoſition to whom, they who defended the cauſe of HENRY IV, are collected by MELCHIOR GOLDASTUS, in his *Replicatio contra Gretſerum et Apologia pro Henrico* IV. *Hanov.* 1611, 4to. Among the modern writers who have treated this ſubject, we may count the *Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes*, BARONIUS, the German and Italian hiſtorians, and thoſe who have wrote the life of the famous MATHILDA. But, beſide theſe, it will be highly proper to conſult JO. SCHILTERUS *De libertate Eccleſiæ Germanicæ*, lib. iv. p. 481.—CHRIST. THOMASIUS *Hiſtoria contentionis inter Imperium et Sacerdotium.*—HEN. MEIBOMIUS *Lib. de jure Inveſtituræ Epiſcopalis*, tom. iii. *Scriptorum rer. Germanicar.*—JUST. CHR. DITHMARUS *Hiſtoria Belli inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*, publiſhed at *Francfort* in 1741, in 8°. and, above all, the famous Cardinal NORIS, who far ſurpaſſes in point of erudition thoſe whom we have mentioned, and whoſe *Iſtoria delle Inveſtiture della dignità Eccleſiaſtiche*, which was publiſhed at *Mantua*, after his death, in the year 1741, is a moſt learned work, though it be imperfect and probably maimed, and alſo extremely partial in favour of the pontifs, which is not ſurprizing from the pen of a cardinal. See alſo JO. JAC. MASCOVII *Commentarii de rebus imperii Germanici ſub Henrico* IV et V, publiſhed at *Leipſick* in 4to. in the year 1749.

thoſe by whom the inveſtiture ſhould be performed [w]. This decree was every way proper to ſurprize the emperors, kings, and princes of *Europe*, who, in conſequence of a prevailing cuſtom, had the right of conferring the more important eccleſiaſtical dignities and the government of monaſteries and convents, of which they diſpoſed, in a ſolemn manner, by the well-known ceremony of the *ring* and the *ſtaff*, or *croſier*, which they preſented to the candidate on whom their choice fell. This ſolemn inveſtiture was the main ſupport of that power of creating biſhops and abbots, which the European princes claimed as their undoubted right, and the occaſion of that corrupt commerce called *ſimony*, in conſequence of which eccleſiaſtical promotion was impudently ſold to the higheſt bidder; and hence the zeal and ardour of GREGORY to annul theſe inveſtitures, that he might extirpate *ſimony* on the one hand, and diminiſh the power of princes in eccleſiaſtical matters on the other.

A ſhort digreſſion concerning INVESTITURES [x].

IT will not be improper to caſt ſome illuſtrations upon the cuſtom now mentioned of inveſting biſhops and abbots in their reſpective dignities by the ceremony of the *ring* and *croſier*, ſince this cuſtom has been ill underſtood by ſome, and but imperfectly explained by others. Even the learned cardinal NORIS appears highly defective here; for though in his *Hiſtory of Inveſtitures* [y], there are many pertinent reflexions upon the reaſons which engaged GREGORY to prohibit *inveſtitures* altogether, yet that learned prelate does not ſeem to have had a complete notion of this important matter, ſince he omits in his hiſtory certain points that are neceſſary to the underſtanding it thoroughly. The *inveſtiture* of biſhops and abbots commenced, undoubtedly, at that period of time when the European emperors, kings, and princes made grants to the clergy of certain territories, lands, foreſts, caſtles, &c. According to the laws of thoſe times (laws which ſtill remain in force) none were conſidered as lawful poſſeſſors of the lands or tenements which they derived from the emperors or other princes, before they repaired to court, took the oath of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns as the ſupreme proprietors, and received from their hands a ſolemn mark by which the property of their reſpective grants was transferred to them. Such was the manner in which the nobility, and thoſe who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves by military exploits, were confirmed in the poſſeſſions which they owed to the liberality of their ſovereigns. But the cuſtom of *inveſting* the biſhops and abbots with the *ring* and the *croſier*, which are the enſigns of the ſacred function, is of a much more recent date, and was then firſt introduced, when the European emperors and princes, annulling the elections that were made in the church according to the eccleſiaſtical laws that had been from the earlieſt times eſtabliſhed for that purpoſe, aſſumed to themſelves the power of confering on whom they pleaſed the biſhoprics and abbeys that became vacant in their dominions, nay, even of ſelling them to the higheſt bidder. This power, then, being once uſurped by the kings and princes of *Europe*, they at firſt confirmed the biſhops and abbots in their dignities and poſſeſſions with the ſame forms and ceremonies that were uſed in inveſting the counts, knights, and others in their feudal tenures, even by written contracts, and the ceremony of preſenting them with a wand or bough [z]. And this cuſtom of *inveſting* the *clergy* and the *laity* with the ſame ceremonies would have, undoubtedly, continued, had not the *clergy*, to whom the right of electing biſhops and abbots originally belonged, eluded artfully the uſurpation of the emperors and other princes by the following ſtratagem. When a biſhop or abbot died, they who looked upon themſelves as authoriſed to fill up the vacancy, elected immediately ſome one of their order in the place of the deceaſed, and were careful to have him conſecrated without delay. The conſecration being thus performed, the prince, who had propoſed to himſelf the profit of ſelling the vacant benefice, or the pleaſure of confering it upon ſome of his favorites, was obliged to deſiſt from his purpoſe, and to conſent to the election which the ceremony of conſecration rendered irrevocable. Many examples of the ſucceſs of this ſtratagem, which was practiſed both in chapters and monaſteries, and which diſappointed the liberality or avarice of ſeveral princes, might here be alledged; they abound in the records of the xth century, to which we refer the curious reader. No ſooner did the emperors and princes perceive this artful management, than they turned their attention to the propereſt means of rendering it ineffectual, and of preſerving the valuable privilege they had uſurped. For this purpoſe they ordered, that as ſoon as a biſhop expired, his *ring* and *croſier* ſhould be tranſmitted to the prince, to whoſe juriſdiction his dioceſe was ſubject. For it was by the ſolemn delivery of the *ring* and *croſier* of the deceaſed to the new biſhop that his election was irrevocably confirmed, and this ceremony was an eſſential part of his *conſecration*; ſo that when theſe two badges of the epiſcopal dignity were in the hands of the ſovereign, the clergy could not *conſecrate* the perſon whom their ſuffrages had appointed to fill the vacancy. Thus their ſtratagem was defeated, as every election that was not confirmed by the ceremony of conſecration might be lawfully annulled and rejected; nor was the biſhop qualified to exerciſe any of the epiſcopal functions before the performance of that important ceremony.

---

[w] ANT. PAGI *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. *ad A.* 1075.—HENR. NORIS *Hiſt. Inveſtiturarum*, p. 39.—CHRIST. LUPUS *Scholia et Diſſertation. ad Concilia*, tom. vi. Opp. p. 39—44.

[x] Here the tranſlator has tranſpoſed the note [r] of the original into the text under the form of a diſſertation.

[y] Chapter iii. page 56.

---

[z] This appears from a paſſage in Cardinal Humbert's IIId Book, *Adverſus Simoniacos*, which was compoſed before Gregory had ſet on foot the diſpute concerning *Inveſtitures*, and which is publiſhed in Martene's *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 787. The paſſage is as follows: *Poteſtas ſecularis primo ambitioſis eccleſiaſticarum dignitatum vel poſſeſſionum cupidis favebat prece, dein minis, deinceps verbis conceſſivis: in quibus omnibus cernens ſibi contradictorem neminem, nec qui moveret pennam, vel aperiret os et ganniret, ad majora progreditur, et jam ſub nomine* INVESTITURÆ DARE PRIMO TABELLAS *vel* QUALESCUMQUE PORRIGERE VIRGULAS, DEIN BACULOS.—*Quod maximum nefas ſic inolevit, ut id ſolum canonicum credatur, nec quæ ſit eccleſiaſtica regula ſciatur aut attendatur.*

mony. As ſoon, therefore, as a biſhop drew his laſt breath, the magiſtrate of the city in which he had reſided, or the governor of the province, ſeized upon his *ring* and *croſier*, and ſent them to court [a]. The emperor or prince confered the vacant ſee upon the perſon whom he had choſen, by delivering to him theſe two badges of the epiſcopal office, after which the new biſhop, thus inveſted by his ſovereign, repaired to his metropolitan, to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony of conſecration, and delivered to him the *ring* and *croſier* which he had received from his prince, that he might receive it again from his hands, and be thus doubly confirmed in his ſacred function. It appears, therefore, from this account, that each new biſhop and abbot received twice the *ring* and the *ſtaff*; once from the hands of the ſovereign, and once from thoſe of the metropolitan biſhop, by whom they were conſecrated [b].

It is highly uncertain by what prince this cuſtom of creating the biſhops by the ceremonies of the *ring* and *croſier* was firſt introduced. If we may believe ADAM of *Bremen* [c], this privilege was exerciſed by LEWIS the Meek, who, in the IXth century, granted to the new biſhops the uſe and poſſeſſion of the epiſcopal revenues, and confirmed this grant by the ceremony now under conſideration. But the accuracy of this hiſtorian is liable to ſuſpicion, and it is extremely probable that he attributed to the tranſactions of ancient times the ſame form that accompanied ſimilar tranſactions in the XIth century in which he lived. For it is certain, that in the IXth century the greateſt part of the European princes made no oppoſition to the right of electing the biſhops, which was both claimed and exerciſed by the clergy and the people, and, of conſequence, there was then no occaſion for the inveſtiture mentioned by ADAM of *Bremen* [d]. We therefore chuſe to adopt the ſuppoſition of Cardinal HUMBERT [e], who places the commencement of the cuſtom now under conſideration in the reign of Otho the Great; for though this opinion has not the approbation of Lewis Thomassin and Natalis Alexander, yet theſe learned men, in their deep reſearches into the origin of inveſtitures [*f*], have advanced nothing ſufficient to prove it erroneous. We learn alſo from Humbert [*g*], that the emperor Henry III, the ſon of Conrad II, was deſirous of abrogating theſe *inveſtitures*, but that a variety of circumſtances concurred to prevent the execution of his deſign; but he repreſents Henry I king of *France* in a different point of light, as a turbulent prince, who turned all things into confuſion, and indulged himſelf beyond all meaſure in ſimoniacal practices, and loads him, of conſequence, with the bittereſt invectives.

---

[a] We ſee this fact confirmed by the following paſſage in EBBO's *Life of Otho, biſhop of Bamberg*, lib. i. § 8, 9. *in Actis Sanctor. menſis Julii*, tom. i. p. 426. *Nec multo poſt annulus cum virgâ paſtorali Bremenſis epiſcopi ad aulam regiam tranſlata eſt. Eo ſiquidem tempore eccleſia liberam electionem non habebat . . . ſed cum quilibet antiſtes viam univerſæ carnis ingreſſus fuiſſet, mox capitanei civitatis illius annulum et virgam paſtoralem ad Palatium tranſmittebant, ſicque regia auctoritate, communicato cum aulicis conſilio, orbatæ plebi idoneum conſtituebat præſulem . . . Poſt paucos vero dies rurſum annulus et virga paſtoralis Bambenbergenſis epiſcopi Domino imperatori tranſmiſſa eſt. Quod audito, multi nobiles — ad aulam regiam confluebant, qui alteram harum prece vel pretio ſibi comparare tentabant.*

[b] This appears from a variety of ancient records. See particularly HUMBERT, Lib. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vi. in MARTENE's *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 779. in which we find the following paſſage: *Sic encæniatus* (i. e. the biſhops inveſted by the emperor) *violentus invadit clerum, plebem et ordinem dominaturus, quam ab eis cognoſcatur, quæratur, petatur. Sic metropolitanum aggreditur, non ab eo judicandus, ſed ipſum judicaturus.—Quid enim ſibi jam pertinet aut prodeſt baculum et annulum, quos portat* REDDERE? *Numquid quia laica perſona dati ſunt? Cur redditur quod habetur, niſi ut aut denuo res eccleſiaſtica ſub hac ſpecie juſſionis vel donationis vendatur, aut in priore venditione corroboranda a metropolitano, ſuiſque ſuffraganeis ſubſcribatur, aut certe ut præſumtio laicæ ordinationis pallietur colore et velamento quodam diſciplinæ clericalis.*

[c] In his *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica*, lib. i. cap. xxxii. p. 10. xxxix. p. 12. publiſhed in the *Scriptores Septemtrionales* of LINDENBROGIUS.

[d] Add to this the refutation of ADAM of *Bremen*, by DANIEL PAPEBROCH, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *Febr.* p. 557.

[e] HUMBERT. Libr. iii. *contra Simoniacos*, cap. vii. p. 780. et cap. xi. p. 787.

In this method of creating biſhops and abbots by preſenting to them the *ring* and *croſier*, there were two things that gave particular offence to the Roman pontifs. The firſt was, that by this the ancient right of election was totally changed, and the power of chooſing the rulers of the church was uſurped by the emperors and other ſovereign princes, and was confined to them alone. This indeed was the moſt plauſible reaſon of complaint, when we conſider the religious notions of theſe times, which were, by no means, favorable to the conduct of the emperors in this matter. Another circumſtance that grievouſly diſtreſſed the pretended vicars of St. Peter, was to ſee the *ring* and *croſier*, the venerable badges of ſpiritual authority and ghoſtly diſtinction, delivered to the biſhop elect by the profane hands of unſanctified laymen; an abuſe this, which they looked upon as little better than ſacrilege. Humbert, who, as we already obſerved, wrote his book againſt ſimony before the conteſt between the emperor and Gregory had commenced, complains [*h*] heavily of this ſuppoſed profanation, and ſhudders to think, that that *ſtaff* which denotes the ghoſtly ſhepherd, and that *ring* which ſeals the myſteries of heaven [*i*], depoſited in the boſoms of the epiſcopal order, ſhould be polluted by the unhallowed touch of a civil magiſtrate; and that emperors and princes, by preſenting them to their favorites, ſhould thereby uſurp the prerogatives of the church, and exerciſe the paſtoral authority and power. This complaint was entirely conſiſtent, as we have already obſerved, with the opinions of the times in which it was made; for as the *ring* and the *croſier* were generally eſteemed the marks and badges of paſtoral power, and ſpiritual authority, ſo he who conferred theſe ſacred badges was ſuppoſed to confer and communicate with them the ghoſtly authority of which they were the emblems.

[*f*] See Ludov. Thomassini *Diſciplina Ecclеſ. circa Benef.* tom. ii. lib. ii. p. 434. and Natal. Alexander, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccl. Capit. Sæc.* xi, xii. *Diſſ.* iv. p. 725.

[*g*] L. c. cap. vii. p. 780.

[*h*] See Humbert *Lib.* iii. *contra Simoniac.* cap. vi. p. 779. 795. his words are: *Quid ad laicas pertinet perſonas ſacramenta eccleſiaſtica et pontificalem ſeu paſtoralem gratiam diſtribuere, camyros ſcilicet baculos et annulos, quibus præcipue perficitur, militat et innititur tota epiſcopalis conſecratio? Equidem in camyris baculis — deſignatur, quæ eis committitur cura paſtoralis.—Porro annulus ſignaculum ſecretorum cœleſtium indicat, præmonens prædicatores, ut ſecretam Dei ſapientiam cum apoſtolo diſſignent.—Quicumque ergo his duobus aliquem initiant, procul dubio omnem paſtoralem auctoritatem hoc præſumendo ſibi vendicant.*

[*i*] Humbert miſtook the ſpiritual ſignification of this holy *ring*, which was the emblem of a nuptial bond between the biſhop and his ſee.

All theſe things being duly conſidered, we ſhall immediately perceive what it was that rendered GREGORY VII ſo averſe to the pretenſions of the emperors, and ſo zealous in depriving them of the privilege they had aſſumed of inveſting the biſhops with the ceremony of the *ring* and *croſier*. In the firſt council which he aſſembled at *Rome*, he made no attempt, indeed, againſt *inveſtitures*, nor did he aim at any thing farther than the abolition of *ſimony*, and the reſtoration of the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders to their ancient right of electing their reſpective biſhops and abbots. But when he afterwards came to know that the affair of *inveſtitures* was inſeparably connected with the pretenſions of the emperors, and indeed ſuppoſed them empowered to diſpoſe of the higher eccleſiaſtical dignities and benefices, he was then perſuaded that *ſimony* could not be extirpated as long as *inveſtitures* were in being, and therefore to pluck up the evil by the root, he oppoſed the cuſtom of inveſtitures with the utmoſt vehemence. All this ſhews the true riſe of the war that was carried on between the pontif and the emperor with ſuch bitterneſs and fury.

And to underſtand ſtill more clearly the merits of this cauſe it will be proper to obſerve, that it was not *inveſtitures* conſidered in themſelves that GREGORY oppoſed with ſuch keeneſs and obſtinacy, but that particular kind of *inveſtitures*, which were in uſe at this time. He did not pretend to hinder the biſhops from ſwearing allegiance to kings and emperors, nor even to become their *vaſſals*; and ſo far was he from prohibiting that kind of inveſtiture that was performed by a verbal declaration or a written deed, that, on the contrary, he allowed the kings of *England* and *France* to *inveſt* in this manner, and probably conſented to the uſe of the *ſcepter* in this ceremony, as did alſo after him CALLIXTUS II. But he could not bear the ceremony of *inveſtiture* that was performed with the enſigns of the ſacerdotal order, much leſs could he endure the performance of the ceremony before the ſolemn rite of conſecration; but what rendered *inveſtitures* moſt odious to this pontif was their deſtroying entirely the free elections of biſhops and abbots. It is now time to reſume the thread of our hiſtory.

Hiſtory of the war that was kindled about *inveſtitures*.

XV. The ſevere law that had been enacted againſt *inveſtitures* by the influence and authority of GREGORY, made very little impreſſion upon HENRY. He acknowledged, indeed, that in expoſing eccleſiaſtical benefices to ſale he had done amiſs, and he promiſed amendment in that reſpect; but he remained inflexible againſt all attempts that were made to perſuade him to reſign his power of creating biſhops and abbots, and the right of *inveſtiture* which was intimately connected with this important privilege. Had this emperor been ſeconded by the German princes he might have maintained this refuſal with dignity and ſucceſs, but this was far from being the caſe; a conſiderable number of theſe princes, and among others the ſtates of *Saxony*, were the ſecret or declared enemies of HENRY, and this furniſhed GREGORY with a favorable opportunity of extending his authority and executing his ambitious projects. This opportunity was by no means neglected; the imperious pontif took occaſion, from the diſcords that divided the empire, to inſult and depreſs its chief; he ſent, by his legates, an inſolent meſſage to the emperor at *Goſlar*, ordering him to repair immediately to *Rome*, and clear himſelf, before the council that was to be aſſembled there, of the various crimes that were laid to his charge. The emperor, whoſe high ſpirit could not brook ſuch arrogant treatment, was filled with the warmeſt indignation at the view of that inſolent mandate, and, in the vehemence of his juſt reſentment, aſſembled without delay a council of the German biſhops at *Worms*, where GREGORY was charged with ſeveral flagitious practices, depoſed from the pontificate of which he was declared unworthy, and an order iſſued out for the election of a new pontif. GREGORY oppoſed violence to violence; for no ſooner had he received by the letters and embaſſadors of HENRY, an account of the ſentence that had been pronounced againſt him, than, in a raging fit of vindictive frenzy, he thundered his anathemas at the head of that prince, excluded him both from the communion of the church and from the throne of his anceſtors, and impiouſly diſſolved the oath of allegiance which his ſubjects had taken to him as their lawful ſovereign. Thus war was declared on both ſides, and the civil and eccleſiaſtical powers were divided into two great factions, of which one maintained the rights of the emperor, while the other ſeconded the ambitious views of the pontif. No terms are ſufficient to expreſs the complicated ſcenes of miſery that aroſe from this deplorable ſchiſm.

XVI. At the entrance upon this war, the Swabian chiefs, with duke RODOLPH at their head, revolted againſt HENRY, and the Saxon princes, whoſe former quarrels with the emperor had been lately terminated by their defeat and ſubmiſſion [*k*], follow their example. Theſe united powers, being ſollicited by the pope to elect a new emperor, in caſe HENRY perſiſted in his obſtinate obedience to the orders of the church, met at *Tribur* in the year 1076, to take counſel together concerning a matter of ſuch high importance. The reſult of their deliberations was far from being favorable to the emperor; for they agreed, that the determination of the controverſy between him and them ſhould be referred to the Roman pontif, who was to be invited for that purpoſe to a congreſs at *Augſburg* the year following, and that, in the mean time, HENRY ſhould be ſuſpended from his royal dignity, and live in the obſcurity of a private ſtation; to which rigorous conditions they alſo added, that he was to forfeit his kingdom, if, within the ſpace of a year, he was not reſtored to the boſom of the church, and delivered from the anathema that lay upon his head. When things were come to this deſperate extremity, and the faction, which was formed againſt this unfortunate prince, grew more formidable from day to day, his friends adviſed him to go into *Italy*, and implore in perſon the clemency of the pontif.

[(*k*) This ſame RODOLPH had, the year before this revolt, vanquiſhed the Saxons, and obliged them to ſubmit to the emperor. Beſides the Swabian and Saxon chiefs, the dukes of *Bavaria* and *Carinthia*, the biſhops of *Wurtzbourg* and *Worms*, and ſeveral other eminent perſonages were concerned in this revolt.]

pontif. The emperor yielded to this ignominious counſel, without, however, obtaining from his voyage the advantages he expected. He paſſed the *Alps* amidſt the rigour of a ſevere winter, arrived, in the month of February 1077, at the fortreſs of *Canuſium*, where the *ſanctimonious* pontif reſided at that time with the young MATHILDA, counteſs of *Tuſcany*, the moſt powerful patroneſs of the church, and the moſt *tender* and affectionate of all the ſpiritual daughters of GREGORY. Here the ſuppliant prince, unmindful of his dignity, ſtood, during three days, in the open air at the entrance of this fortreſs, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and with no other raiment but a wretched piece of coarſe woollen cloth thrown over his body to cover his nakedneſs. The fourth day he was admitted to the preſence of the lordly pontif, who, with a good deal of difficulty, granted him the abſolution he demanded; but as to what regarded his reſtoration to the throne, he refuſed to determine that point before the approaching congreſs, at which he made HENRY promiſe to appear, forbidding him, at the ſame time to aſſume, during this interval, the title of king, as alſo to wear the ornaments, or to exerciſe the functions, of royalty. This opprobrious convention excited, and that juſtly, the indignation of the princes and biſhops of *Italy*, who threatned HENRY with all ſorts of evils, on account of his baſe and puſillanimous conduct, and would, undoubtedly, have depoſed him, had not he diminiſhed their reſentment by violating the convention which he had been forced to enter into with the imperious pontif, and reſuming the title and other marks of royalty which he had been obliged to lay down. On the other hand, the confederate princes of *Swabia* and *Saxony* were no ſooner informed of this unexpected change in the conduct of HENRY, than they aſſembled at *Forcheim* in the month of March A. D. 1077, and unanimouſly elected RODOLPH, duke of *Swabia*, emperor in his place [*l*].

XVII. This raſh ſtep kindled a terrible flame in *Germany* and *Italy*, and involved, for a long time, thoſe unhappy lands in the calamities of war. In *Italy* the Normans, who were maſters of the lower parts of that country, and the armies of the powerful and valiant MATHILDA maintained ſucceſsfully the cauſe of GREGORY againſt the Lombards, who eſpouſed the intereſts of HENRY; while this unfortunate prince, with all the forces he could aſſemble, carried on the war in *Germany* againſt RODOLPH and the confederate princes. GREGORY, conſidering the events of war as extremely doubtful, was at firſt afraid to declare for either ſide, and therefore obſerved, during a certain time, an appearance of neutrality; but encouraged by the battle of *Fladenheim*, in which HENRY was defeated by the Saxons A. D. 1080, he excommunicated anew that vanquiſhed prince, and ſending a crown to the victor RODOLPH, declared him lawful king of the Germans. The injured emperor did not let this new inſult paſs unpuniſhed; ſeconded by the ſuffrages of ſeveral of the Italian and German biſhops, he depoſed Gregory a ſecond time in a council which met at *Mentz*, and, in a ſynod that was ſoon after aſſembled at *Brixen*, in the province of *Tirol*, he raiſed to the pontificate Guibert, archbiſhop of *Ravenna*, who aſſumed the title of Clement III, when he was conſecrated at *Rome* A. D. 1084, four years after his election.

[*l*] The ancient and modern writers of Italian and German hiſtory have given ample relations of all theſe events, though not all with the ſame fidelity and accuracy. In the brief account I have given of theſe events, I have followed the genuine ſources, and thoſe writers whoſe teſtimonies are the moſt reſpectable and ſure, ſuch as SIGONIUS, PAGI, MURATORI, MASCOVIUS, NORIS, &c. who, though they differ in ſome minute circumſtances, are yet agreed in thoſe matters that are of the moſt importance.

XVIII. This election was followed ſoon after by an event which gave an advantageous turn to the affairs of Henry; this event was a bloody battle fought upon the banks of the river *Elſter*, where Rodolph received a mortal wound, of which he died at *Merſburg*. The emperor, having got rid of this formidable enemy, marched directly into *Italy* the following year (1081) with a deſign to cruſh Gregory and his adherents, whoſe defeat he imagined would contribute effectually to put an end to the troubles in *Germany*. Accordingly he made ſeveral campaigns, with various ſucceſs, againſt the valiant troops of Mathilda; and after having raiſed twice the ſiege of *Rome*, he reſumed a third time that bold enterprize, and became, at length, maſter of the greateſt part of that city in the year 1084. The firſt ſtep that Henry took after this ſucceſs was to place Guibert in the papal chair, after which he received the imperial crown from the hands of the new pontif, was ſaluted emperor by the Roman people, and laid cloſe ſiege to the caſtle of *St. Angelo*, whither his mortal enemy, Gregory, had fled for ſafety. He was, however, forced to raiſe this ſiege by the valour of Robert Guiscard, duke of *Apulia* and *Calabria*, who brought Gregory in triumph to *Rome*; but not thinking him ſafe there, conducted him afterwards to *Salernum*. In this place the famous pontif ended his days the year following A. D. 1085, and left *Europe* involved in thoſe calamities which were the fatal effects of his boundleſs ambition. He was certainly a man of extenſive abilities, endowed with a moſt enterprizing genius, and an invincible firmneſs of mind; but it muſt, at the ſame time, be acknowledged, that he was the moſt arrogant and audacious pontif that had hitherto ſat in the papal chair. The Roman church worſhips him as a ſaint, though it is certain that he was never placed in that order by a regular canonization. Paul V, about the beginning of the xvii^th^ century, appointed the twenty fifth day of May, as a feſtival ſacred to the memory of this pretended ſaint [m]; but the emperors of *Germany*, the kings of *France*, and other European princes have always oppoſed the celebration of this feſtival, and have thus effectually prevented its becoming univerſal. In our times Benedict XIII, zealous to ſecure to Gregory the ſaintly honours, occaſioned a conteſt, whoſe iſſue was by no means favorable to his ſuperſtitious views [n].

---

[m] See the *Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. ad d.* xxv *Maii*, and Jo. Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* vi. part. II.

[n] The reader will find an ample and curious account of this matter in a French book publiſhed in *Holland* in the year 1743, in three volumes, under the following title: *L'Avocat du Diable, ou Memoires Hiſtoriques et Critiques ſur la vie et ſur la Legende du Pape Gregoire* VII.

XIX. The death of GREGORY neither reſtored peace to the church, nor tranquillity to the ſtate; the tumults and diviſions which he had excited, ſtill continued, and they were augmented from day to day by the ſame paſſions to which they owed their origin. CLEMENT III, who was the emperor's pontif [o], was maſter of the city of *Rome*, and was acknowledged as pope by a great part of *Italy*. HENRY carried on the war in *Germany* againſt the confederate princes. The faction of GREGORY, ſupported by the Normans, choſe for his ſucceſſor, in the year 1086, DIDERICK, abbot of mount *Caſſin*, who adopted the title of VICTOR III, and was conſecrated in the church of St. PETER, in the year 1087, when that part of the city was recovered by the Normans from the dominion of CLEMENT. But this new pontif was of a character quite oppoſite to that of GREGORY; he was modeſt and timorous, and alſo of a mild and gentle diſpoſition; and finding the papal chair beſet with factions, and the city of *Rome* under the dominion of his competitor, he retired to his monaſtery, where ſoon after he ended his days in peace. But before his abdication, he held a council at *Benevento*, where he confirmed and renewed the laws that GREGORY had enacted for the abolition of *inveſtitures*.

XX. OTHO, biſhop of *Oſtia*, and monk of *Clugni*, was, by VICTOR'S recommendation, choſen to ſucceed him. This new pontif was elected at *Terracina* in the year 1088, and aſſumed the name of URBAN II. Inferior to GREGORY in fortitude and reſolution, he was, however, his equal in arrogance and pride, and ſurpaſſed him greatly in temerity and imprudence [p]. The commencement of his pontificate had a fair aſpect, and ſucceſs ſeemed to ſmile upon his undertakings; but upon the emperor's return into *Italy* in the year 1090, the face of affairs was totally changed; victory crowned the arms of that prince, who, by redoubled efforts of valour, defeated, at length, GUELPH, duke of *Bavaria*, and the famous MATHILDA, who were the formidable heads of the papal faction. The abominable treachery of his ſon CONRAD, who, yielding to the ſeduction of his father's enemies, revolted againſt him, and, by the advice and aſſiſtance of URBAN and MATHILDA, uſurped the kingdom of *Italy*, revived the drooping ſpirits of that faction, who hoped to ſee the laurels of the emperor blaſted by this odious and unnatural rebellion. The conſequences, however, of this event were leſs fatal to HENRY, than his enemies expected. In the mean time the troubles of *Italy*, ſtill continued, nor could URBAN, with all his efforts, reduce the city of *Rome* under his lordly yoke. Finding all his ambitious meaſures diſconcerted, he aſſembled a council at *Placentia* in the year 1095, where he confirmed the laws, and the anathemas of Gregory; and afterwards undertook a journey into *France*, where he held the famous council of *Clermont*, and had the pleaſure of kindling a new war againſt the infidel poſſeſſors of the holy land. In this council, inſtead of endeavouring to terminate the tumults and deſolations that the diſpute concerning *inveſtitures* had already produced, this unworthy pontif added fuel to the flame, and ſo exaſperated matters by his imprudent and arrogant proceedings, as to render an accommodation between the contending parties more difficult than ever. Gregory, notwithſtanding his exceſſive arrogance and ambition, had never carried his inſolence ſo far as to forbid the biſhops and the reſt of the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns. This rebellious prohibition was reſerved for the audacious arrogance of Urban, who publiſhed it as a law, in the council of *Clermont* [q]. After this *noble* expedition, the reſtleſs pontif returned into *Italy*, where he made himſelf maſter of the caſtle of *St. Angelo*, and ſoon after ended his days in the year 1099; he was not long ſurvived by his antagoniſt Clement III, who died the following year, and thus left Raynier, a Benedictine monk, who was choſen ſucceſſor to Urban, and aſſumed the name of Paschal II, ſole poſſeſſor of the papal chair at the concluſion of this century.

---

[o] The very learned JO. GOTTL. HORNIUS engaged himſelf, in the *Miſcell. Lipſ.* tom. viii. p. 609. to publiſh the *Life of* CLEMENT III. This pontif died in the year 1100, as appears evidently from the *Chronicon Beneventanum*, publiſhed by MURATORI, in his *Antiquit. Italicar.* tom. i. p. 262. See alſo RUBEI *Hiſtoria Ravennat.* lib. v. p. 307.

[p] We find in the *Poſthumous Works of* MABILLON, tom. iii. p. 1. the *Life of* URBAN II, compoſed by THEOD. RUINART, with much learning and induſtry, but with too little impartiality and fidelity, as we may naturally ſuppoſe even from the name of its author, ſince it is well known that no monkiſh writer dare attempt to paint the Roman pontifs in their true colours.—See alſo for an account of URBAN the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 514.

The ſtate of the monaſtic orders.

XXI. Among the eaſtern monks, in this century, there happened nothing worthy of being conſigned to the records of hiſtory, while thoſe of the weſt were concerned immediately in tranſactions of great conſequence, and which deſerve the attention of the curious reader. The weſtern monks were remarkable for their attachment to the Roman pontifs; this connexion had been long formed, and it was originally owing to the avarice and violence of both biſhops and princes, who, under various pretexts, were conſtantly encroaching upon the poſſeſſion of the monks, and thus obliged them to ſeek for ſecurity againſt theſe invaſions of their property in the protection of the popes. This protection was readily granted by the pontifs, who ſeized, with avidity, every occaſion of enlarging their authority; and the monks, in return, engaged themſelves to pay an annual tribute to their ghoſtly patrons. But in this century things were carried ſtill farther, and the pontifs, more eſpecially Gregory VII, who was eagerly bent upon humbling the biſhops, and transfering their privileges to the Roman ſee, enlarged their juriſdiction over the monks at the expence of the epiſcopal order. They adviſed and exhorted the monks to withdraw themſelves and their poſſeſſions from the juriſdiction of the biſhops, and to place both under the inſpection and dominion of St. Peter [r]. Hence it happened that from the time of GREGORY, the number of monaſteries that had received *immunities* both from the temporal authority of the ſovereign and the ſpiritual juriſdiction of the biſhops, were multiplied beyond meaſure throughout all *Europe*, and the rights of princes, together with the intereſts and privileges of the epiſcopal order, were violated and trampled upon, or rather engroſſed to ſwell the growing deſpotiſm of the all-graſping pontifs [s].

---

[q] To the xv canon of this council the following words were added: *Ne epiſcopus vel ſacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciant*, i. e. *It is enacted that no biſhop or prieſt ſhall promiſe upon oath* liege obedience *to any king or any layman.* They are entirely miſtaken, who affirm that Gregory prohibited the biſhops from taking oaths of allegiance to their reſpective ſovereigns, as Cardinal Noris has ſufficiently demonſtrated in his *Iſtoria delle Inveſtiture*, chap. x. p. 279.

[r] A ſpecimen of this may be ſeen in the vii Epiſtle of Gregory, in which he reduces the monks of *Redon* under the juriſdiction of the Roman ſee by a mandate conceived in terms that had

ir corrup-

XXII. All the writers of this age complain of the ignorance, licentiouſneſs frauds, debaucheries, diſſenſions, and enormities that diſhonoured by far the greateſt part of the monaſtic orders, not to mention the numerous marks of their diſſolution and impiety that have been handed down to our times [t]. However aſtoniſhed we may be at ſuch horrid irregularities among a ſet of men whoſe deſtination was ſo ſacred, and whoſe profeſſion was ſo auſtere, we ſhall ſtill be more ſurprized to learn that this degenerate order, ſo far from loſing ought of their influence and credit on account of their licentiouſneſs, were promoted, on the contrary, to the higheſt eccleſiaſtical dignities, and beheld their opulence and authority increaſing from day to day. Our ſurprize, indeed, will be diminiſhed when we conſider the groſs ignorance and ſuperſtition, and the unbounded licentiouſneſs and corruption of manners. that reigned in this century among all ranks and orders of men [u]. Ignorance and corruption pervert the taſte and judgment of even thoſe who are not void of natural ſagacity, and often prevent their being ſhocked at the greateſt inconſiſtencies. Amidſt this general depravation of ſentiments and conduct, amidſt the flagitious crimes that were daily perpetrated not only by the laity, but alſo by the various orders of the clergy, both *ſecular*, and *regular*, all ſuch as reſpected the common rules of decency, or preſerved in their external demeanour the leaſt appearance of piety and virtue, were looked upon as ſaints, of the higheſt rank, and conſidered as the peculiar favorites of heaven. This circumſtance was, no doubt, favorable to many of the monks, who were leſs profligate than the reſt of their order, and might contribute more or leſs to ſupport the credit of the whole body. Beſides, it often happened that princes, dukes, knights, and generals, whoſe days had been conſumed in debauchery and crimes, and diſtinguiſhed by nothing but

never been uſed before his time; ſee MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. i. p. 204. We may add to this ſeveral like mandates of URBAN II and the ſucceeding pontifs, which are to be found in the collection now cited, and in others of that kind.

[s] There is not, perhaps, in *Germany* one ſingle inſtance of this pernicious *immunity* before the time of GREGORY VII.

[t] See JO. LAUNOY, *Aſſert. in privileg. S. Medardi*, cap. xxvi. § vi. Opp. tom. iii. part. II. p. 499. and SIMON *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 331.

[u] For an account of the aſtoniſhing corruption of this age, ſee BLONDEL *De Formula, regnante Chriſto*, p. 14 —BOULAINVILLIERS *De l'Origine et des Droits de la Nobleſſe* in MOLET's *Memoires de Litterature et d'Hiſtoire*, tom. ix. part. I. p. 63. The corruption and violence that reigned with impunity in this horrid age gave occaſion to the inſtitutions of chivalry or knighthood, in conſequence of which a certain ſet of equeſtrian heros undertook the defence of the poor and feeble, and particularly of the fair-ſex againſt the inſults of powerful oppreſſors and raviſhers. This order of knights errant was certainly of great uſe in theſe miſerable times, when the majeſty of laws and government was fallen into contempt, and they, who bore the title of ſovereigns and magiſtrates, had neither reſolution nor power to maintain their authority, or to perform the duties of their ſtations.

the violent exploits of unbridled luſt, cruelty, and avarice, felt at the approach of old age, or death, the inexpreſſible anguiſh of a wounded conſcience, and the gloomy apprehenſions and terrors it excites. In this dreadful condition, what was their reſource? what were the means by which they hoped to diſarm the uplifted hand of divine juſtice, and render the governour of the world propitious? They purchaſed at an enormous price the prayers of the monks to ſcreen them from judgment, and devoted to God and to the ſaints a large portion of the fruits of their rapine, or entered themſelves into the monaſtic order, and bequeathed their poſſeſſions to their new brethren. And thus it was that monkery received perpetually new acceſſions of opulence and credit.

The monks of *Clugni.*

XXIII. The monks of *Clugni* in *France* ſurpaſſed all the other religious orders in the renown they had acquired from a prevailing opinion of their eminent ſanctity and virtue. Hence their diſcipline was univerſally reſpected, and hence alſo their rules were adopted by the founders of new monaſteries, and the reformers of thoſe that were in a ſtate of decline. Theſe famous monks aroſe, by degrees, to the very higheſt ſummit of worldly proſperity, by the preſents which they received from all quarters; and their power and credit grew, with their opulence, to ſuch a height, that, towards the concluſion of this century, they were formed into a ſeparate ſociety, which ſtill ſubſiſts under the title of the *order*, or *congregation of Clugni* [w]. And no ſooner were they thus eſtabliſhed than they extended their ſpiritual dominion on all ſides, reducing, under their juriſdiction, all the monaſteries which they had reformed by their counſels, and engaged to adopt their religious diſcipline. The famous Hugo, ſixth abbot of *Clugni*, who was in high credit at the court of *Rome*, and had acquired the peculiar protection and eſteem of ſeveral princes, laboured, with ſuch ſucceſs, in extending the power and juriſdiction of his order, that, before the end of this century, he ſaw himſelf at the head of five and thirty of the principal monaſteries in *France*, beſides a conſiderable number of ſmaller convents that acknowledged him as their chief. Many other religious ſocieties, though they refuſed entering into this new order, and continued to chooſe their reſpective governors, yet ſhewed ſuch reſpect for the *abbot* of *Clugni*, or the *arch-abbot*, as he ſtyled himſelf, that they regarded him as their ſpiritual chief [x]. This enormous augmentation of opulence and authority was, however, fruitful of many evils; it increaſed the arrogance of theſe aſpiring monks, and contributed much to the propagation of the ſeveral vices, that diſhonoured the religious ſocieties of this licentious and ſuperſtitious age. The monks of *Clugni* degenerated ſoon from their primitive ſanctity, and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, were diſtinguiſhed by nothing but the peculiarities of their diſcipline from the reſt of the monaſtic orders.

---

[w] For a particular account of the rapid and monſtrous ſtrides, which the order of *Clugni* made o opulence and dominion, ſee Steph. Baluzius *Miſcellan.* tom. v. p. 343. and tom. vi. p. 436. s alſo Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. *paſſim.*

[x] Mabillon *Præfat. ad Sæc.* v. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. xxvi.—*Hiſt. Generale de Bourgogne ar les Moines Benedictins*, tom. i. p. 151. publiſhed at *Paris* in folio, in the year 1739.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 470.

XXIV. The example of theſe monks excited ſeveral pious men to erect particular monaſtic fraternities, or congregations like that of *Clugni*; the conſequence of which was that the Benedictine order, which had been hitherto one great and univerſal body, was now divided into ſeparate ſocieties, which, though they were ſubject to one general rule, yet differed from each other in various circumſtances both of their diſcipline and manner of living, and rendered their diviſion ſtill more conſpicuous by reciprocal exertions of animoſity and hatred. In the year 1023, ROMUALD, an Italian fanatic, retired to *Camaldoli* [*y*], on the mount *Appennine*, and, in that ſolitary retreat, founded the order, or *congregation of the Camaldolites*, which ſtill remains in a flouriſhing ſtate, particularly in *Italy*. His followers were diſtinguiſhed into two claſſes, of which the one were Cœnobites, and the other Eremites. Both obſerved a ſevere diſcipline; but the Cœnobites had degenerated much from their primitive auſterity [*z*].

Some time after this, GUALBERT, a native of *Florence*, founded at *Val-Ombroſo*, ſituated in the *Appennines*, a congregation of Benedictine monks, who, in a ſhort ſpace of time, propagated their diſcipline in ſeveral parts of *Italy* [*a*]. To theſe two Italian monaſteries we may add that of *Hirſauge* in *Germany* [*b*], erected by WILLIAM, an eminent abbot, who had reformed many ancient convents, and was the founder of ſeveral new eſtabliſhments. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the monaſtery of *Hirſauge* was rather a branch of the congregation of *Clugni*, whoſe laws and manner of living it had adopted, than a new fraternity.

Ciſtertian monks.

XXV. Towards the concluſion of this century [*c*], ROBERT, abbot of *Molême* in *Burgundy*, having employed, in vain, his moſt zealous efforts to revive the decaying piety and diſcipline of his convent, and to oblige his monks to obſerve, with more exactneſs, the rule of St. BENEDICT, retired, with about twenty monks, who had not been infected with the diſſolute turn of their brethren, to a place called *Citeaux*, in the dioceſe of *Chalons*. In this retreat, which was at that time a miſerable deſert, covered on all ſides with brambles and thorns, but which bears, at preſent, a quite different aſpect, ROBERT laid the foundations of the famous order, or *congregation of Ciſtertians*, which, like that of *Clugni*, made a moſt rapid and aſtoniſhing progreſs, was propagated through the greateſt part of *Europe* in the following century, and was not only enriched with the moſt liberal and ſplendid donations, but alſo acquired the form and privileges of a ſpiritual republic, and exerciſed a ſort of dominion over all the monaſtic orders [*d*]. The great and fundamental law of this new fraternity was the rule of St. BENEDICT, which was to be ſolemnly and rigorouſly obſerved; to this were added ſeveral other inſtitutions and injunctions, which were deſigned to maintain the authority of this rule, to enſure its obſervance, and to defend it againſt the dangerous effects of opulence, and the reſtleſs efforts of human corruption to render the beſt eſtabliſhments imperfect. Theſe injunctions were exceſſively auſtere, grievous to nature, but pious and laudable in the eſteem of a ſuperſtitious age. They did not, however, ſecure the ſanctity of this holy congregation, ſince the ſeducing charms of opulence, that corrupted the monks of *Clugni* much ſooner than was expected, produced the ſame effect among the Ciſtertians, whoſe zeal, in the rigorous obſervance of their rule, began gradually to diminiſh, and who, in proceſs of time, grew as negligent and diſſolute as the reſt of the Benedictines [*e*].

[*y*] Otherwiſe called *Campo-Malduli*.

[*z*] The writers, who have given any ſatisfactory accounts of the order of the *Camaldolites*, are enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 895. Add to theſe ROMUALDI VITA *in Actis Sanctor. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 101. and in MABILLON's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* vi. part. I. p. 247.—HELYOT *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 236.—MABILLON *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 261.—MAGNOALDI ZEIGELBAVER. *Centifolium Camaldulenſe, ſive Notitia Scriptor. Camaldulenſium*, publiſhed at *Venice* in the year 1750.

[*a*] See the life of GUALBERT in MABILLON's *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc.* vi. part. II. p. 273.—HELYOT *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 298. Many intereſting circumſtances relating to the hiſtory of this order have been publiſhed by the learned LAMI, in the *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, publiſhed at *Florence*, tom. ii. p. 238. as alſo p. 272. 279. where the ancient laws of the order are enumerated; ſee alſo *tom.* iii. of the ſame work, p. 177. 212.

[*b*] See MABILLON *Acta Sanctorum Benedict. Sæc.* vi. part. II. p. 716.—HELYOT *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 332.

[*c*] In the year 1098.

New monaſtic orders.

XXVI. Beſides theſe convents that were founded upon the principles, and might be conſidered as branches of the Benedictine order, ſeveral other monaſtic ſocieties were formed, which were diſtinguiſhed by peculiar laws, and by rules of diſcipline and obedience, which they had drawn up for themſelves. To many of thoſe gloomy and fanatical monks, whoſe auſterity was rather the fruit of a bad habit of body, than the reſult of a religious principle, the rule of BENEDICT appeared too mild; to others it ſeemed incomplete and defective, and not ſufficiently accommodated to the exerciſe of the various duties we owe to the ſupreme Being. Hence STEPHEN, a nobleman of *Auvergne* (who is called by ſome STEPHEN *de Muret*, from the place where he firſt erected the convent of his order) obtained, in the year 1073, from GREGORY VII, the privilege of inſtituting a new ſpecies of monaſtic diſcipline. His firſt deſign was to ſubject his fraternity to the rule of St. BENEDICT, but he changed his intention, and compoſed, himſelf, the body of laws, which was to be their rule of life, piety, and manners. In theſe laws there were many injunctions that ſhewed the exceſſive auſterity of their author. Poverty and obedience were the two great points which he inculcated with the warmeſt zeal, and all his regulations were directed to promote and ſecure them in this new eſtabliſhment; for this purpoſe it was ſolemnly enacted, that the monks ſhould poſſeſs no lands beyond the limits of their convent; that the uſe of fleſh ſhould be allowed to none, not even to the ſick and infirm; and that none ſhould be permitted to keep cattle, that they

---

[d] [In about an hundred years after its firſt eſtabliſhment, this order boaſted of 1800 abbeys, and was become ſo powerful, that it governed almoſt all *Europe*, both in ſpirituals and temporals.]

[e] The principal hiſtorian of the *Ciſtertian Order* is ANG. MANRIQUES, whoſe *Annales Ciſtertienſes*, an ample and learned work, were publiſhed in four volumes, folio, at *Lyons*, in the year 1642. After him we may place PIERRE LE NAIN, whoſe *Eſſai de l'Hiſtoire de l'Ordre des Citeaux*, was printed in the year 1696, at *Paris*, in nine volumes in 8^{vo}. The other hiſtorians, who have given accounts of this famous order, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1066. Add to theſe HELYOT's *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. v. p. 341. and MABILLON, who, in the fifth and ſixth volumes of his *Annales Benedictini*, has given a learned and accurate account of the origin and progreſs of the Ciſtertians.

might not be expoſed to the temptation of violating their frugal regimen. To theſe ſevere precepts many others of equal rigour were added; for this gloomy legiſlator impoſed upon his fraternity the ſolemn obſervance of a profound and uninterrupted ſilence, and inſiſted ſo much upon the importance and neceſſity of ſolitude, that none but a few perſons of the higheſt eminence and authority were permitted to paſs the threſhold of his monaſtery. He prohibited all intercourſe with the ſex, and indeed excluded his order from all the comforts and enjoyments of life. His followers were divided into two claſſes, of which the one comprehended the *clerks*, and the other, what he called, the *converted brethren*. The former were totally abſorbed in the contemplation of divine things, while the latter were charged with the care and adminiſtration of whatever related to the concerns and neceſſities of a preſent life. Such were the principal circumſtances of the new inſtitution founded by STEPHEN, which aroſe to the higheſt pitch of renown in this and the following century, and was regarded with the moſt profound veneration as long as its laws and diſcipline were obſerved; but two things contributed to its decline, and at length brought on its ruin; the firſt was, the violent conteſt which aroſe between the *clerks* and the *converts*, on account of the pre-eminence which the latter pretended over the former; and the ſecond was, the gradual diminution of the rigour and auſterity of STEPHEN's rule, which was ſoftened and mitigated from time to time, both by the heads of the order, and by the Roman pontifs. This once famous monaſtic ſociety was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *Order of Grandmontains*, as *Muret*, where they were firſt eſtabliſhed, was ſituated near *Grammont*, in the province of *Limoges* [*f*].

The order of the Carthuſians.

XXVII. In the year 1084 [*g*], was inſtituted the famous order of Carthuſians, ſo called from *Chartreux*, a diſmal and wild ſpot of ground near *Grenoble* in *Dauphine*, ſurrounded with barren mountains and craggy rocks. The founder of this monaſtic ſociety, which ſurpaſſed all the reſt in the extravagant auſterity of their manners and diſcipline, was BRUNO, a native of *Cologn*, and canon of the cathedral of *Rheims* in *France*. This zealous eccleſiaſtic, who had neither power to reform, nor patience to bear the diſſolute manners of his archbiſhop MANASSE, retired from his church with ſix of his companions, and, having obtained the permiſſion of HUGH, biſhop of *Grenoble*, fixed his reſidence in the miſerable deſert already mentioned [*h*].

[*f*] The origin of this order is related by BERNARD GUIDON, whoſe treatiſe upon that ſubject is publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Manuſcriptorum* PHIL. LABBEI, tom ii. p 275. For an account of the hiſtory of this celebrated ſociety, ſee JO. MABILLON *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. p. 65 ſ. p. 99. tom. vi. p. 116. and *Præf. ad Actor. SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc.* vi. part. II. p. 34.—HELYOT *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 409.—*Gallia Chriſtiana Monachor. Benedict.* tom. ii. p. 645.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionenſ.* tom. i. p. 158. *et Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 486.—[The life and ghoſtly exploits of STEPHEN, the founder of this order, are recorded in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Februarii*, p. 199.]

[*g*] Some place the inſtitution of this order in the year 1080, and others in the year 1086.

[*h*] The learned FABRICIUS mentions, in his *Biblioth. Latina medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 784. ſeveral writers who have compoſed the hiſtory of BRUNO and his order, but his enumeration is incomplete; ſince there are yet extant many hiſtories of the Carthuſians, that have eſcaped his notice. See INNOCENT. MASSONI *Annales Carthuſian.* publiſhed in the year 1687.—PETRI ORLANDI *Chronicon Carthuſianum*, and the elegant, though imperfect hiſtory of the order in queſtion, which

He adopted at firſt the rule of St. BENEDICT, to which he added a conſiderable number of ſevere and rigorous precepts; his ſucceſſors, however, went ſtill farther, and impoſed upon the Carthuſians new laws, much more intolerable than thoſe of their founder, laws which inculcated the higheſt degrees of auſterity that the moſt gloomy imagination could invent [i]. And yet, notwithſtanding all this, it is remarkable, that no monaſtic ſociety degenerated ſo little from the ſeverity of their primitive inſtitution and diſcipline as this of the Carthuſians. The progreſs of their order was indeed leſs rapid, and their influence leſs extenſive in the different countries of *Europe*, than the progreſs and influence of thoſe monaſtic eſtabliſhments, whoſe laws were leſs rigorous, and whoſe manners were leſs auſtere. It was a long time before the tender ſex could be engaged to ſubmit to the ſavage rules of this melancholy inſtitution; nor had the Carthuſian order ever reaſon to boaſt of a multitude of females ſubjected to its juriſdiction; it was too forbidding to captivate a ſex, which, though ſuſceptible of the ſeductions of enthuſiaſm, is of a frame too delicate to ſupport the ſeverities of a rigorous ſelf-denial [k].

The order of St. Anthony of *Vienne.*

XXVIII. Towards the concluſion of this century [l], the *order* of St. ANTHONY of *Vienne* in *Dauphine*, was inſtituted for the relief and ſupport of ſuch as were ſeized with grievous diſorders, and particularly with the diſeaſe called *St. Anthony's fire*. All who were infected with that peſtilential

---

is to be found in HELYOT's *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 366. Many important illuſtrations on the nature and laws of this famous ſociety have been publiſhed by MABILLON, in his *Annales Benedictini*, tom. vi. p. 638. 683. A particular and accurate account of BRUNO has been given by the Benedictine monks, in their *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 233. but a yet more ample one will be undoubtedly given by the compilers of the *Acta Sanctorum*, when they ſhall have carried on their work to the 6th of October, which is the feſtival conſecrated to the memory of BRUNO. It was a current report in ancient times, that the occaſion of BRUNO's retreat was the miraculous reſtoration of a certain prieſt to life, who, while the funeral ſervice was performing, raiſed himſelf up and ſaid, *By the juſt judgment of God I am damned*, and then expired. This ſtory is looked upon as fabulous by the moſt reſpectable writers even of the Roman church, eſpecially ſince it has been refuted by LAUNOY, in his treatiſe *De cauſa Seceſſus Brunonis in Deſertum*. Nor does it ſeem to preſerve its credit among the Carthuſians, who are more intereſted than others in this pretended miracle. Such of them, at leaſt, as affirm it, do it with a good deal of modeſty and diffidence. The arguments on both ſides are candidly and accurately enumerated by CÆS. EGASS. DU BOULAY, in his *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 467.

[i] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc.* vi. part. II. *Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.* p. 37.

[k] The Carthuſian nuns have not ſufficiently attracted the attention of the authors who have written concerning this famous order; nay, ſeveral writers have gone ſo far as to maintain, that there was not in this order a ſingle convent of nuns. This notion, however, is highly erroneous; as there were formerly ſeveral convents of Carthuſian virgins, of which indeed the greateſt part have not ſubſiſted to our times. In the year 1368, there was an extraordinary law paſſed, by which the eſtabliſhment of any more female Carthuſian convents was expreſly prohibited. Hence there remain only five at this day; four in *France*, and one at *Bruges* in *Flanders*. See the *Varietés Hiſtoriques Phyſiques et Litteraires*, tom. i. p. 80. publiſhed at *Paris* in 8vo in the year 1752. Certain it is, that the rigorous diſcipline of the Carthuſians is quite inconſiſtent with the delicacy and tenderneſs of the female ſex; and therefore in the few female convents of that order that ſtill ſubſiſt, the auſterity of that diſcipline has been diminiſhed, as well from neceſſity, as from humanity and wiſdom; it was more particularly found neceſſary to abrogate thoſe ſevere injunctions of *ſilence* and *ſolitude*, that are ſo little adapted to the known character and genius of the ſex.

[l] In the year 1095.

diſorder repaired to a cell built near *Vienne* by the Benedictine monks of *Grammont*, in which the body of St. ANTHONY was ſaid to repoſe, that, by the prayers and interceſſion of this eminent ſaint, they might be miraculouſly healed. GASTON, an opulent nobleman of *Vienne*, and his ſon GUERIN, pretended to have experienced in their complete recovery the marvellous efficacy of St. ANTHONY's interceſſion, and, in conſequence thereof, devoted themſelves and their poſſeſſions, from a principle of pious gratitude, to the ſervice of St. ANTHONY, and to the performance of generous and charitable offices towards all ſuch as were afflicted with the miſeries of poverty and ſickneſs. Their example was followed, at firſt, but by eight perſons; their community, however, was afterwards conſiderably augmented. They were not bound by particular vows like the other monaſtic orders, but were conſecrated, in general, to the ſervice of God, and lived under the juriſdiction of the monks of *Grammont*. In proceſs of time, growing opulent and powerful by the multitude of pious donations they received from all parts, they withdrew themſelves from the dominion of the Benedictines, propagated their order in various countries, and, at length, obtained, in the year 1297, from BONIFACE VIII, the dignity and privileges of an independent congregation, under the rule of St. AUGUSTIN [*m*].

The order of canons.

XXIX. The licentiouſneſs and corruption, that had infected all the other ranks and orders of the clergy, was alſo remarkable among the *canons*, which was a middle ſort of order between the monks and ſecular prieſts, and whoſe firſt eſtabliſhment was in the VIIIth century. In certain provinces of *Europe* the *canons* were corrupted to a very high degree, and ſurpaſſed, in the ſcandalous diſſolution of their manners, all the other eccleſiaſtical and monaſtic orders. Hence ſeveral pious and virtuous perſons exerted their zeal for the reformation of this degenerate body; ſome pontifs appeared in this good cauſe, and more eſpecially NICOLAS II, who, in a council held at *Rome* in the year 1059, abrogated the ancient rule of the canons, which had been drawn up at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, and ſubſtituted another in its place [*n*]. Theſe laudable attempts were attended with conſiderable ſucceſs, and a much better rule of diſcipline was eſtabliſhed in almoſt all the canonical orders, than that which had been formerly in uſe. It was not, however, poſſible to regulate them all upon the ſame footing, and to ſubject them to the ſame degree of reformation and diſcipline; nor indeed was this neceſſary. Accordingly a certain number of theſe canonical colleges were erected into communities, the reſpective members of which had one common dwelling, and a common table, which was the point chiefly inſiſted upon by the pontifs, as this alone was ſufficient to prevent the *canons* from entering into the bonds of matrimony. It did not, however, exclude them from the poſſeſſion or enjoyment of private property; for they reſerved to themſelves the right of appropriating to their own uſe the fruits and revenues of their benefices, and of employing them, as they thought expedient. Other canonical congregations ſubjected themſelves to a rule of life leſs agreeable and commodious, in conſequence of the zealous exhortations of IVO, or IVES biſhop of *Chartres*, renouncing all their worldly poſſeſſions and proſpects, all private property, and living in a manner that reſembled the auſterity of the monaſtic orders. Hence aroſe the well-known diſtinction between the *ſecular* and the *regular canons*; the former of which obſerved the decree of NICOLAS II, while the latter, more prone to mortification and ſelf-denial, complied with the directions and juriſdictions of IVO; and as this auſtere prelate imitated St. AUGUSTIN [o] in the manner of regulating the conduct of his clergy, his *canons* were called, by many, the *regular canons of St. Auguſtin* [p].

[*m*] See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Januarii*, p. 160.—HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 108.—GABR. PENOTT. *Hiſtoria Canonicorum regular.* lib. ii. c. 70.—JO. ERH. KAPPII *Diſſ. de fratribus S. Antonii*, publiſhed at *Leipſick* in the year 1737.—For an account of the preſent ſtate of the principal hoſpital or reſidence of this order, where the abbot remains, ſee MARTENE and DURAND *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur.* tom. i. p. 260.

[*n*] This decree of NICOLAS II, by which the primitive rule of the *canons* was changed, is publiſhed by MABILLON among the papers, which ſerve as proofs to the 4th volume of his *Annales Benedictini*, and alſo in the *Annals* themſelves. See tom. iv. *Annal. Bened.* p. 748. as alſo lib. lxi. § xxxv. p. 586.

The principal Greek writers.

XXX. The moſt eminent Greek writers of this century, were,

THEOPHANES *Cerameus*, i. e. the *potter*, of whom there is yet extant a volume of *Homilies*, that are not altogether contemptible;

[(o) St. AUGUSTIN committed to writing no particular rule for his clergy; but his manner of ruling them may be learned from ſeveral paſſages in his *Epiſtles*.]

[p] See MABILLON *Annal. Benedictin.* tom. iv. p. 586. *et Opera Poſthuma*, tom. ii. p. 102. 115.—HELYOT *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 11.—LUD. THOMASSINI *Diſciplina Eccleſiæ circa Beneficia*, tom. i. part. I. lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 657.—MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p 257.—In the *Gallia Chriſtiana* of the Benedictine monks, we find frequent mention made both of this reformation of the *canons*, and alſo of their diviſion into *ſeculars* and *regulars*. The *regular canons* are much diſpleaſed with all the accounts, that render the origin of their community ſo recent; they are extremely ambitious of appearing with the venerable character of an ancient eſtabliſhment, and therefore trace back their firſt riſe through the darkneſs of the remoteſt ages, to CHRIST himſelf, or at leaſt to St. AUGUSTIN. But the arguments and teſtimonies, by which they pretend to ſupport this imagined antiquity of their order, are a proof of the weakneſs of their cauſe and of the vanity of their pretenſions, and are not, therefore, worthy of a ſerious refutation. It is true, the title of *canons* is, undoubtedly, of much more ancient date, than the XIth century, but not as applied to a particular order or inſtitution, for at its firſt riſe it was uſed in a very vague general ſenſe (ſee CLAUD. DE VERT *Explications des Ceremonies de la Meſſe*, tom. i. p. 58.) and therefore the mere exiſtence of the title proves nothing. At the ſame time, it is evident beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, that we find not the leaſt mention made of the diviſion of the *canons* into *regular* and *ſecular* before the XIth century. And it is equally certain, that thoſe *canons*, who had nothing *in common* but their *dwelling* and *table*, were called *ſecular*; while thoſe who had diveſted themſelves of all private property, and had every thing, without exception, in common with their fraternity, were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *regular canons*.

[(p) To Dr. MOSHEIM's account of the *canons*, it may not be improper to add a few words concerning their introduction into *England*, and their progreſs and eſtabliſhment among us. The *order of regular canons of St. Auguſtin* was brought into *England* by ADELWALD, confeſſor to HENRY I, who firſt erected a priory of his order at *Noſtel* in *Yorkſhire*, and had influence enough to have the church of *Carliſle* converted into an epiſcopal ſee, and given to regular canons inveſted with the privilege of chuſing their biſhop. This order was ſingularly favoured and protected by HENRY I, who gave them, in the year 1107, the priory of *Dunſtable*, and by queen MAUD, who erected for them, the year following, the priory of the *Holy Trinity* in *London*, the prior of which was always one of the twenty-four aldermen. They increaſed ſo prodigiouſly, that, beſides the noble priory of *Merton*, which was founded for them, in the year 1117, by GILBERT, an earl of the Norman blood, they had, under the reign of EDWARD I, fifty-three priories, as appears by the catalogue preſented to that prince, when he obliged all the monaſteries to receive his protection and to acknowledge his juriſdiction.]

NILUS DOXOPATRIUS, who was remarkable for his knowledge in matters relating to eccleſiaſtical polity;

NICETAS PECTORATUS, who was a moſt ſtrenuous defender of the religious ſentiments and cuſtoms of the Greek church;

MICHAEL PSELLUS, whoſe vaſt progreſs in various kinds of learning and ſcience procured him a moſt diſtinguiſhed and ſhining reputation;

MICHAEL CERULARIUS, biſhop or patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, who imprudently revived the controverſy between the Greeks and Latins, which had been for ſome time happily ſuſpended;

SIMEON, the Younger, author of a book of *Meditations on the Duties of the Chriſtian life*, which is yet extant;

THEOPHYLACT, a Bulgarian, whoſe illuſtrations of the ſacred writings were received with univerſal approbation and eſteem [q].

Latin writers.

XXXI. The writers, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves moſt among the Latins, were they that follow:

FULBERT, biſhop of *Chartres*, eminent for his love of letters, and his zeal for the education of youth, as alſo for various compoſitions, particularly his epiſtles, and famous for his exceſſive and enthuſiaſtic attachment to the Virgin MARY [r];

HUMBERT, a Cardinal of the Roman church, who far ſurpaſſed all the Latins, both in the vehemence and learning which appeared in his controverſial writings againſt the Greeks [s];

PETRUS DAMIANUS, who, on account of his genius, candor, probity, and various erudition, deſerves to be ranked among the moſt learned and eſtimable writers of this century; though he was not altogether untainted with the reigning prejudices and defects of the times [t];

MARIANUS SCOTUS, whoſe *Chronicle*, with ſeveral other compoſitions, is yet extant;

ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, a man of great genius and ſubtilty, deeply verſed in the dialectic of this age, and moſt illuſtriouſly diſtinguiſhed by his profound and extraordinary knowledge in theology [u];

LANFRANC, alſo archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his *Commentary upon the Epiſtles of St.* PAUL, as alſo by ſeveral other productions [w], which, conſidering the age in which

[q] For a more ample account of theſe Greek writers, the reader may conſult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[r] For a farther account of this eminent man, ſee the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 261.

[s] See MARTENE *Theſaurus Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 629.—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. vii. p 527.

[t] See the *Acta Sanctor. Febr.* tom. iii p. 406.—*General Dictionary*, at the article DAMIEN. —CASIM. OUDINI *Diſſ.* in tom. ii. *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* p. 686.

[u] See the *Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 398.—RAPIN THOYRAS *Hiſt. d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 65. 166. *de l'ed. en* 4to.—COLONIA *Hiſtoire Litter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 210.—We have already given a more ample account of the eminent abilities and learned productions of ANSELM

[w] Among theſe productions, we may reckon LANFRANC's *Letters* to pope ALEXANDER II, to HILDEBRAND, while archdeacon of *Rome*, and to ſeveral biſhops in *England* and *Normandy*; as alſo *A Commentary upon the Pſalms*; *A Treatiſe concerning Confeſſion*; *An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, which is not extant; and *A remarkable Diſſertation concerning the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*.

he lived, diſcover an uncommon meaſure of ſagacity and erudition [x];

BRUNO of mount *Caſſin*, and the other famous eccleſiaſtic of that name, who founded the monaſtery of the Carthuſians;

Ivo, biſhop of *Chartres*, who was ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed by his zeal and activity in maintaining the rights and privileges of the church;

HILDEBERT, archbiſhop of *Tours*, who was a philoſopher, and a poet as well as a divine, without being either eminent or contemptible in any of theſe characters [y]; but, upon the whole, a man of conſiderable learning and capacity;

GREGORY VII, that imperious and arrogant pontif, of whom we have ſeveral productions, beſide his *Letters*.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the church in this century.

The ſtate of religion.

I. IT is not neceſſary to draw at full length the hideous portrait of the religion of this age. It may eaſily be imagined, that its features were full of deformity, when we conſider that its guardians were equally deſtitute of knowledge and virtue, and that the heads and rulers of the Chriſtian church, inſtead of exhibiting models of piety, held forth in their conduct ſcandalous examples of the moſt flagitious crimes. The people were ſunk in the groſſeſt ſuperſtition, and employed all their zeal in the worſhip of images and relics, and in the performance of a trifling round of ceremonies, which were impoſed upon them by the tyranny of a deſpotic prieſthood. The more learned, 'tis true, retained ſtill ſome notions of the truth, which, however, they obſcured and corrupted by a wretched mixture of opinions and precepts, of which ſome were ludicrous, others pernicious, and the moſt of them equally deſtitute of truth and utility. There were, no doubt, in ſeveral places, judicious and pious men, who would have willingly lent a ſupporting hand to the declining cauſe of true religion; but the violent prejudices of a barbarous age rendered all ſuch attempts not only dangerous, but even deſperate; and thoſe choſen ſpirits, who had eſcaped the general contagion, lay too much concealed, and had therefore too little influence to combat, with ſucceſs, the formidable patrons of impiety and ſuperſtition, who were extremely numerous, in all ranks and orders, from the throne to the cottage.

Witneſſes of the truth.

II. Notwithſtanding all this, we find, from the time of GREGORY VII, ſeveral proofs of the zealous efforts of thoſe, who are generally called, by the proteſtants, the *witneſſes of the truth*; by whom are meant, ſuch pious and

---

In this laſt performance, LANCFRANC endeavours to prove againſt BERENGER the reality of a *corporal preſence* in the euchariſt; though it is manifeſt, that this opinion was not the doctrine of the church of *England* in the concluſion of the tenth, or the commencement of the following century. See COLLIER's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Great Britain*, vol. i. p. 260. 263.]

[x] *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 260.

[y] The Benedictine monks publiſhed, in folio, at *Paris*, in the year 1708, the *Works* of HILDEBERT, illuſtrated by the obſervations of BEAUGENDRE.

judicious Chriſtians, as adhered to the pure religion of the goſpel, and remained uncorrupted amidſt the growth of ſuperſtition; who deplored the miſerable ſtate to which Chriſtianity was reduced by the alteration of its divine doctrines, and the vices of its profligate miniſters; who oppoſed, with rigour, the tyrannic ambition both of the lordly pontif and the aſpiring biſhops; and in ſome provinces privately, in others openly, attempted the reformation of a corrupt and idolatrous church, and of a barbarous and ſuperſtitious age. This was, indeed, bearing witneſs to the truth in the nobleſt manner, and it was principally in *Italy* and *France* that the marks of this heroic piety were exhibited. [Nor is it at all ſurprizing, that the reigning ſuperſtition of the times met with this oppoſition; it is aſtoniſhing, on the contrary, that this oppoſition was not much greater and more univerſal, and that millions of Chriſtians ſuffered themſelves to be hood-winked with ſuch a tame ſubmiſſion, and cloſed their eyes upon the light with ſo little reluctance.] For notwithſtanding the darkneſs of the times, and the general ignorance of the true religion that prevailed in all ranks and orders, yet the very fragments of the goſpel (if we may uſe that term) which were ſtill red and explained to the people, were ſufficient, at leaſt, to convince the moſt ſtupid and illiterate, that the religion, which was now impoſed upon them, was not the true religion of JESUS; that the diſcourſes, the lives and morals of the clergy were directly oppoſite to what the divine Saviour required of his diſciples, and to the rules he had laid down for the direction of their conduct; that the pontifs and biſhops abuſed, in a ſcandalous manner, their power and opulence; and that the favour of God, and the ſalvation exhibited in his bleſſed goſpel, were not to be obtained by performing a round of external ceremonies, by pompous donations to churches and prieſts, or by founding and enriching monaſteries, but by real ſanctity of heart and manners.

III. It muſt, indeed, be acknowledged, that they who undertook, with ſuch zeal and ardour, the reformation of the church were not, for the moſt part, equal to this arduous and important enterprize, and that by avoiding, with more vehemence than circumſpection, certain abuſes and defects, they ruſhed unhappily into the oppoſite extremes. They all perceived the abominable nature of thoſe inventions with which ſuperſtition had disfigured the religion of JESUS; but they had alſo loſt ſight of the true nature and genius of that celeſtial religion, that lay thus disfigured in the hands of a ſuperſtitious and diſſolute prieſthood. They were ſhocked at the abſurdities of the eſtabliſhed worſhip; but few of them were ſufficiently acquainted with the ſublime precepts and doctrines of genuine Chriſtianity, to ſubſtitute in the place of this ſuperſtitious worſhip a rational ſervice. Hence their attempts of reformation, even where they were ſucceſsful, were extremely imperfect, and produced little more than a motley mixture of truth and falſhood, of wiſdom and indiſcretion; of which we might alledge a multitude of examples. Obſerving, for inſtance, that the corruption and licentiouſneſs of the clergy were, in a great meaſure, occaſioned by their exceſſive opulence, and their vaſt poſſeſſions, they conceived raſhly the higheſt ideas of the ſalutary effects of indigence, and looked upon voluntary poverty as the moſt eminent and illuſtrious virtue of a Chriſtian miniſter. They had alſo formed to themſelves a notion, that the primitive church was to be the ſtanding and perpetual model, according to which the rites, government, and worſhip of all Chriſtian churches were to be regulated in all the ages of the world, and that the lives and manners of the holy apoſtles were to be rigorouſly followed, in every reſpect by all the miniſters of Christ. [Theſe notions which were injudiciouſly taken up, and blindly entertained (without any regard to the difference of times, places, circumſtances, and characters; without conſidering that the provident wiſdom of Christ and his apoſtles left many regulations to the prudence and piety of the governours of the church) were productive of many pernicious effects, and threw theſe good reformers, whoſe zeal was not always according to knowledge, from the extreme of ſuperſtition into the extreme of enthuſiaſm.] Many, well meaning perſons, whoſe intentions were highly laudable, fell into great errors in conſequence of theſe ill-grounded notions. Juſtly incenſed at the conduct of the ſuperſtitious multitude, who placed the whole of religion in external ſervices, and hoped to ſecure their ſalvation by the performance of a laborious round of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, they raſhly maintained that true piety was to be confined entirely to the inward motions and affections of the ſoul, and to the contemplation of ſpiritual and divine things. In conſequence of this ſpecious yet erroneous principle, they treated with the utmoſt contempt all the external parts of religious worſhip, and aimed at nothing leſs than the total ſuppreſſion of ſacraments, churches, religious aſſemblies of every kind, and Chriſtian miniſters of every order.

Commentators and expoſitors.

IV. Several of both the Greek and Latin writers employed their learned and pious labours in the expoſition and illuſtration of the holy ſcriptures. Among the Latins, **Bruno** wrote a commentary on the *Book of Pſalms*, **Lanfranc** upon the *Epiſtles of St. Paul*, **Berenger** upon the *Revelations of St. John*, **Gregory** VII upon the *Goſpel of St. Matthew*, and others upon other parts of the ſacred writings. But all theſe expoſitors, in compliance with the prevailing cuſtom of the times, either copied the explications of the ancient commentators, or made ſuch whimſical applications of certain paſſages of ſcripture, both in explaining the doctrines and in inculcating the duties of religion, that it is often difficult to peruſe them without indignation or diſguſt. The moſt eminent of the Grecian expoſitors was **Theophylact**, a native of *Bulgaria*; though he alſo is indebted to the ancients, and, in a particular manner, to St. **Chrysostom**, for the greateſt part of his moſt judicious obſervations [z]. Nor muſt we paſs in ſilence the commentary upon the *Book of Pſalms*, and the *Song of Solomon*, that was compoſed by the learned **Michael Psellus**; nor the *Chain* of commentaries upon the *Book of Job*, which we owe to the induſtry of **Nicetas**.

---

[z] For an account of Theophylact, ſee Rich. Simon *Hiſtoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* ch. xxviii. p. 390. & *Critique de la Bibliotheque des auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques, par Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 310. where he alſo ſpeaks largely concerning Nicetas and Oecumenius.

The ſcholaſtic theology.

V. All the Latin doctors, if we except a few Hibernian divines, who blended with the beautiful ſimplicity of the goſpel the perplexing ſubtilties of an obſcure philoſophy, had hitherto derived their ſyſtem of religion, and their explications of divine truth, either from the holy ſcriptures alone, or from theſe ſacred oracles explained by the illuſtrations, and compared with the theology of the ancient doctors. But in this century certain writers, and among others, the famous BERENGER [*a*], went much farther, and employed the rules of logic and the ſubtilties of metaphyſical diſcuſſions, both in explaining the doctrines of ſcripture, and in proving the truth of their own particular opinions. Hence LANFRANC, the antagoniſt of BERENGER, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, introduced into the field of religious controverſy the ſame philoſophical arms, and ſeemed, in general, deſirous of employing the dictates of reaſon to illuſtrate and confirm the truths of religion. His example, in this reſpect, was followed by ANSELM, his diſciple and ſucceſſor in the ſee of *Canterbury*, a man of a truly metaphyſical genius, and capable of giving the greateſt air of dignity and importance to the *firſt philoſophy*. Such were the beginnings of that philoſophical theology, which grew afterwards, by degrees, into a cloudy and enormous ſyſtem, and, from the public ſchools in which it was cultivated, acquired the name of *ſcholaſtic divinity* [*b*]. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve, that the eminent divines, who firſt ſet on foot this new ſpecies of theology, and thus laudably maintained that moſt noble and natural connexion of FAITH with REASON, and of RELIGION with PHILOSOPHY, were much more prudent, and moderate than their followers, in the uſe and application of this conciliatory ſcheme. They kept, for the moſt part, within bounds, and wiſely reflected upon the limits of reaſon; their language was clear; the queſtions they propoſed were inſtructive and intereſting; they avoided all diſcuſſions that were only proper to ſatisfy a vain and idle curioſity; and, in their diſputes and demonſtrations, they made, generally ſpeaking, a wiſe and ſober uſe of the rules of logic, and of the dictates of philoſophy [*c*]. [Their followers, on the contrary, ran

---

[(*a*) Otherwiſe called BERENGARIUS, and famous for the noble oppoſition he made to the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which LANFRANC ſo abſurdly pretended to ſupport upon philoſophical principles. The attempt of this latter to introduce the rules of logic into religious controverſy would have been highly laudable, had not he perverted this reſpectable ſcience to the defence of the moſt monſtrous abſurdities.]

[*b*] See CHR. AUGUST. HEUMANNI *Præfat. ad Tribbechovii Librum de Doctoribus Scholaſticis*, p. 14.—The ſentiments of the learned, concerning the firſt author or inventor of the ſcholaſtic divinity, are collected by JO. FRANC. BUDDEUS, in his *Iſagoge ad Theolog.* tom. i. p. 358.

[*c*] We ſhall here tranſcribe a paſſage from the works of LANFRANC, who is conſidered by many as the father of the ſcholaſtic ſyſtem, that the reader may ſee how far the firſt ſchoolmen ſurpaſſed their diſciples and followers in wiſdom, modeſty, and candour. We take this paſſage from that prelate's book concerning *The Body and Blood of Chriſt* *, and it is as follows: *Teſtis mihi Deus eſt et conſcientia mea, quia in tractatu divinarum litterarum nec proponere nec ad propoſitas reſpondere cuperem dialecticas quæſtiones, vel carum ſolutiones. Et ſi quando materia diſputandi talis eſt, ut hujus artis regulis valeat enucleatius explicari, in quantum poſſum, per æquipollentias propoſitionum tego artem, ne videar magis arte, quam veritate, ſanctorumque patrum authorite confidere.* LANFRANC here declares in the moſt ſolemn manner, even by an appeal to God and his conſcience, that he was ſo far from having the leaſt inclination to propoſe or to anſwer logical queſtions in the courſe of his theological labours, that, on the contrary, when he was forced to have recourſe to the ſcience of dialectic, in order to the

* Cap. vii. p. 236. Opp. Ed. LUC. DACHERII.

with a metaphyſical-frenzy into the greateſt abuſes, and, by the moſt unjuſtifiable perverſion of a wiſe and excellent method of ſearching after, and confirming truth, they baniſhed evidence out of religion, common ſenſe out of philoſophy, and erected a dark, and enormous maſs of pretended ſcience, in which *words* paſſed for *ideas*, and *ſounds* for *ſenſe*.]

VI. No ſooner was this new method introduced, than the Latin doctors began to reduce all the doctrines of religion into one permanent and connected ſyſtem, and to treat theology as a ſcience; an enterprize, which had hitherto been attempted by none, but TAIO, of *Saragoſſa*, a writer of the VIIth century, and the learned DAMASCENUS, who flouriſhed among the Greeks in the following age. The Latin doctors had hitherto confined their theological labours to certain branches of the Chriſtian religion, which they illuſtrated only on certain occaſions. The firſt production which looked like a general ſyſtem of theology was that of the celebrated ANSELM; this however was ſurpaſſed by the complete and univerſal body of divinity, which was compoſed, towards the concluſion of this century, by HILDEBERT, archbiſhop of *Tours*, who ſeems to have been regarded both as the firſt and the beſt model in this kind of writing, by the innumerable legions of ſyſtem-makers, who aroſe in ſucceeding times [d]. This learned prelate demonſtrated firſt the doctrines of his ſyſtem by proofs drawn from the holy ſcriptures, and alſo from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church; and in this he followed the cuſtom that had prevailed in the preceding ages; but he went yet farther, and anſwered the objections, which might be brought againſt his doctrine, by arguments drawn from reaſon and philoſophy; this part of his method was entirely new, and peculiar to the age in which he lived [e].

Moral writers.

VII. The moral writers of this century, who undertook to unfold the obligations of Chriſtians, and to delineate the nature, the extent, and the

---

better to illuſtrate his ſubject, he concealed the ſuccours he derived from thence with all poſſible care, leſt he ſhould ſeem to place more confidence in the reſources of *art*, than in the ſimplicity of *truth*, and the *authority of the holy fathers*. Theſe laſt words ſhew plainly the *two* ſources from whence the Chriſtian doctors had hitherto derived all their tenets, and the arguments by which they maintained them, *viz.* from the holy ſcriptures which LANFRANC here calls the *truth*, and from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church. To theſe two ſources of theology and argumentation, a *third* was added in this century, even the ſcience of logic, which, however, was only employed by the managers of controverſy to repulſe their adverſaries, who came armed with ſyllogiſms, or to remove difficulties which were drawn from reaſon and from the nature of things. But, in ſucceeding times, the two former ſources were either entirely neglected or ſparingly employed, and philoſophical demonſtration, or, at leaſt, ſomething that bore that name, was regarded as a ſufficient ſupport to the truths of religion.

[d] This body of divinity, which was the firſt complete theological ſyſtem that had been compoſed among the Latins, is inſerted in the *Works* of HILDEBERT, publiſhed by BEAUGENDRE, who ſhews evidently, in his *Preface*, that PETER LOMBARD, PULLUS, and the other writers of theological ſyſtems, did no more than follow ſervilely the traces of HILDEBERT.

[e] It may not be improper to place here a paſſage which is taken from a treatiſe of ANSELM's, entitled, *Cur Deus homo?* ſince this paſſage was reſpected by the firſt ſcholaſtic divines, as an immutable law in theology; *Sicut rectus ordo exigit*, ſays the learned prelate, *ut profunda fidei Chriſtianæ credamus, priuſquam ea præſumamus ratione diſcutere: ita negligentia mihi videtur, ſi, poſtquam confirmati ſumus in fide, non ſtudemus quod credimus intelligere*; which amounts to this, *That we muſt firſt believe without examination, but muſt afterwards endeavour to underſtand what we believe.*

various branches of true virtue and evangelical obedience, treated this moſt excellent of all ſciences in a manner quite unſuitable to its dignity and importance. We find ſufficient proofs of this in the moral writings of PETER DAMIEN [*f*], and even of the learned HILDEBERT [*g*]. The moraliſts of this age generally confined themſelves to a jejune explication of, what are commonly called, the four cardinal virtues, to which they added the *Ten Commandments*, to complete their ſyſtem. ANSELM, the famous prelate of *Canterbury*, ſurpaſſed, indeed, all the moral writers of his time; the books which he compoſed, with a deſign to promote practical religion, and more eſpecially his *Book of Meditations and Prayers*, contain many excellent things, ſeveral happy thoughts expreſſed with much energy and unction. [Nor did the myſtic divines ſatisfy themſelves with piercing, by *extatic thought* and *feeling*, into the ſublime regions of *beauty* and *love*; they *conceived*, and *brought forth* ſeveral productions that were deſtined to diffuſe the pure delights of *union* and *communion* through enamoured ſouls.] JOHANNES JOHANNELLUS, a Latin myſtic, wrote a treatiſe concerning *Divine Contemplation* [*h*]; and SIMEON, the younger, who was a Grecian ſage of the ſame viſionary claſs, compoſed ſeveral diſcourſes upon ſubjects of a like nature.

The ſtate of controverſial divinity.

VIII. Among the controverſial writers of this century, we ſee the effects of the ſcholaſtic method that BERENGER and LANFRANC had introduced into the ſtudy of theology. We ſee divines entering the liſts armed with ſyllogiſms, which they manage awkardly, and aiming rather to confound their adverſaries by the ſubtilties of logic, than to convince them by the power of evidence. While thoſe, who were unprovided with this philoſophical armour made a ſtill more wretched and deſpicable figure, fell into the groſſeſt and moſt perverſe blunders, and ſeem to have written without either thinking of their ſubject, or of the manner of treating it with ſucceſs. DAMIANUS, already mentioned, defended the truth of Chriſtianity againſt the Jews; but his ſucceſs was not equal to the warmth of his zeal, or to the uprightneſs of his intentions. SAMUEL, a convert from *Judaiſm* to Chriſtianity, wrote an elaborate treatiſe againſt thoſe of his nation, which is ſtill extant. But the nobleſt champion, that appeared at this period of time in the cauſe of religion, was the famous ANSELM, who attacked the enemies of Chriſtianity, and the audacious contemners of all religion in an ingenious work [*i*], which was perhaps, by its depth and acuteneſs, above the comprehenſion of thoſe whom it was deſigned to convince of their errors. [For it happened, no doubt, in theſe earlier times, as it frequently does in our days, that many gave themſelves out for unbelievers, who knew not the firſt principles of reaſoning, and whoſe incredulity was the fruit of ignorance and preſumption, nouriſhed by licentiouſneſs and corruption of heart.]

The controverſy between the Greeks and Latins revived.

IX. The famous conteſt between the Greek and Latin churches, which though not decided, had, however, been ſuſpended for a conſiderable time, was imprudently revived, in the year 1053, by MICHAEL CERULARIUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, a man of a reſtleſs and turbulent ſpirit, who blew the flame of religious diſcord, and widened the fatal breach by new invectives and new accuſations. The pretexts that were employed to juſtify this new rupture, were zeal for the truth, and an anxious concern about the intereſts of religion; but its true cauſes were the arrogance and ambition of the Grecian patriarch and the Roman pontif. The latter was conſtantly forming the moſt artful ſtratagems to reduce the former under his imperious yoke; and, for this purpoſe, he left no means unemployed to gain over to his ſide the biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, by withdrawing them from the juriſdiction of the ſee of *Conſtantinople*. The tumultuous and unhappy ſtate of the Grecian empire was ſingularly favorable to his aſpiring views, as the friendſhip and alliance of the Roman pontif was highly uſeful to the Greeks in their ſtruggles with the Saracens and the Normans, who were ſettled in *Italy*. On the other hand, the Grecian pontif was not only determined to refuſe obſtinately the leaſt mark of ſubmiſſion to his haughty rival, but was alſo laying ſchemes for extending his dominion, and for reducing all the Oriental patriarchs under his ſupreme juriſdiction. Thus the contending parties were preparing for the field of controverſy, when CERULARIUS began the charge by a warm letter wrote in his own name, and in the name of LEO, biſhop of *Achrida*, who was his chief counſellor, to JOHN, biſhop of *Trani*, in *Apulia*, in which he publicly accuſed the Latins of various errors [*k*]. LEO IX, who was then in the papal chair, anſwered this letter in a moſt imperious manner; and, not ſatisfied with ſhewing his indignation by mere words, aſſembled a council at *Rome*, in which the Greek churches were ſolemnly excommunicated [*l*].

[*f*] See PETRUS DAMIANUS, *De Virtutibus*.

[*g*] See HILDEBERTI *Philoſophia Moralis*, et *Libellus de* IV *Virtutibus honeſtæ vitæ*.

[*h*] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 48.

[*i*] This work was entitled, *Liber adverſus inſipientem*, i. e. *The fool refuted*.

X. CONSTANTINE, ſurnamed *Monomachus*, who was now at the head of the Grecian empire, endeavoured to ſtifle this controverſy in its birth, and, for that purpoſe, deſired the Roman pontif to ſend legates to *Conſtantinople*, to concert meaſures for reſtoring and confirming the tranquillity of the church. Three legates were accordingly ſent from *Rome* to that imperial city, who brought with them letters from LEO IX not only to the emperor, but alſo to the Grecian pontif. Theſe legates were cardinal HUMBERT, a man of a high and impetuous ſpirit, PETER, archbiſhop of *Amalfi*, and FREDERIC, archdeacon and chancellor of the church of *Rome*. The iſſue of this congreſs was unhappy in the higheſt degree, notwithſtanding the propenſity which the emperor, for political reaſons [*m*], diſcovered to the cauſe of the biſhop of *Rome*. The arrogance of LEO IX, and his inſolent letters, excited the higheſt indignation in the breaſt of CERULARIUS, and produced a perſonal averſion to this audacious pontif, which inflamed, inſtead of healing, the wounds of the church; while, on the other hand, the Roman legates gave many and evident proofs, that the deſign of their embaſſy was not to reſtore peace and concord, but to eſtabliſh among the Greeks the ſupreme authority and the ghoſtly dominion of *Rome's* imperious pontif. Thus all hopes of a happy concluſion of theſe miſerable diviſions entirely vaniſhed, and the Roman legates finding their efforts ineffectual to overcome the vigorous reſiſtance of CERULARIUS, they, with the higheſt inſolence, as well as imprudence, excommunicated publicly in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 1054, the Grecian patriarch, with LEO of *Achrida*, and all their adherents; and leaving a written act of their inhuman imprecations and anathemas upon the grand altar of that temple, they *ſhook the duſt off their feet*, and thus departed. This violent ſtep rendered the evil incurable, which it was before not only poſſible, but perhaps eaſy to remedy. The Grecian patriarch imitated the vehemence of the Roman legates, and did from reſentment what they had perpetrated from a principle of ambition and arrogance. He excommunicated theſe legates with all their adherents and followers in a public council, and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication, which they had pronounced againſt the Greeks [*n*]. Theſe vehement meaſures were followed on both ſides with a multitude of controverſial writings, that were filled with the moſt bitter and irritating invectives and ſerved no other purpoſe, than to add fuel to the flame.

[*k*] See an account of theſe errors § xi.

[*l*] Theſe letters of CERULARIUS and LEO are publiſhed in the *Annals* of BARONIUS, *ad An.* 1053 —The former is alſo inſerted by CANISIUS, in his *Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 281. ed. nov. —LEONIS *Concilia*, &c.

[(*m*) He ſtood greatly in need of the aſſiſtance of the Germans and Italians againſt the Normans, and hoped to obtain it by the good offices of the pope, who was in high credit with the emperor HENRY III.]

XI. CERULARIUS added new accuſations to the ancient charge which had been brought by PHOTIUS againſt the Latin churches, of which the principal was, that they uſed unleavened bread in the celebration of the Lord's ſupper. This accuſation (ſuch were the times!) was looked upon as a matter of the moſt ſerious nature, and of the higheſt conſequence; it was, therefore, debated between the Greeks and Latins with the utmoſt vehemence, nor did the Grecian and Roman pontifs contend with more fury and bitterneſs about the extent of their power, and the limits of their juriſdiction, than the Greek and Latin churches diſputed about the uſe of unleavened bread. The other heads of accuſation that were brought againſt the Latins by the Grecian pontif diſcovered rather a malignant and contentious ſpirit, and a profound ignorance of genuine Chriſtianity, than a generous zeal for the cauſe of truth. He complains, for inſtance, in the heavieſt manner, that the Latins don't abſtain from the uſe of blood and of things ſtrangled; that their monks eat lard, and permit the uſe of fleſh to ſuch of the brethren as are ſick or infirm; that their biſhops adorn their fingers with rings, as if they were bride-grooms; that their prieſts are beardleſs; and that in the rite of baptiſm they confined themſelves to one ſingle immerſion [*o*]. Such were the miſerable and trifling objects that excited a fatal ſchiſm, and kindled a furious war between the Greeks and Latins, who carried their animoſities to the greateſt lengths, and loaded each other with reciprocal invectives and imprecations. The attentive reader will form from hence a juſt idea of the deplorable ſtate of religion both in the eaſtern and weſtern world at this period, and will ſee, in this dreadful ſchiſm, the true origin of the various ſects that multiplied the different forms of ſuperſtition and error in theſe unhappy times.

[*n*] Beſides BARONIUS and other writers, whoſe accounts of this period of time are generally known, and not always exact, ſee MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. lib. lx. *ad A.* 1053. *et Præf. ad Sæc.* vi. *Actor. SS. Benedicti*, part. II. p. 1.—LEO ALLATIUS, *De libris Græcor. Eccleſiaſt. Diſſ.* ii. p. 160. ed. *Fabricii*, et *De Perpetua Eccleſ. Orient. et Occident. Conſenſione*, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 614.—MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriente Chriſtiano*, tom. i. p. 260. *et Diſſ. Damaſcena prima*, § xxxi. p. 16.—HERMANNI *Hiſtoria Concertationum de pane Azymo et fermentato*, p. 59. publiſhed at *Leipſic* in the year 1739.—JO. BAPT. COTELERIUS, *Monum. Eccleſiæ Græcæ*, tom. ii. p. 108.

A new controverſy concerning the ſanctity of images.

XII. This vehement diſpute which the Greeks had to carry on againſt the Latin churches was well nigh followed by a fatal diviſion among themſelves. Amidſt the ſtraits and difficulties to which the empire was now reduced by the expences of war, and the calamities of the times, Alexius not only employed the treaſures of the church in order to anſwer the exigencies of the ſtate, but ordered alſo the plates of ſilver, and the figures of that metal that adorned the portals of the churches, to be taken down and converted into money. This meaſure excited the indignation of Leo, biſhop of *Chalcedon*, a man of auſtere morals, and of an obſtinate ſpirit, who maintained that the emperor, in this ſtep, was guilty of ſacrilege; and to prove this charge, publiſhed a treatiſe, in which he affirmed, that in the images of Jesus Christ, and of the ſaints, there reſided a certain kind of *inherent ſanctity*, that was a proper object of religious worſhip, and that, therefore, the adoration of Chriſtians ought not to be confined to the perſons repreſented by theſe images, but extended alſo to the images themſelves. This new controverſy excited various tumults and ſeditions among the people, to ſuppreſs which the emperor aſſembled a council at *Conſtantinople*, in which the queſtion was terminated by the following deciſions: "That the images of "Christ, and of the *ſaints*, were to be honoured only with a *relative worſhip* [*p*], which was to be offered, not to the ſubſtance or matter of which "theſe images were compoſed, but to the *form* and *features* of which they "bore the impreſſion; that the repreſentations of Christ, and of the "ſaints, whether in painting or ſculpture, did in no ſenſe *partake of the nature* of the divine Saviour, or of theſe holy men, though they were en"riched with a certain communication of divine grace; and, laſtly, that "invocation and worſhip were to be addreſſed to the ſaints, only as the "ſervants of Christ, and on account of their relation to him, as their "maſter." Theſe deciſions abſurd and ſuperſtitious as they were, were not enough ſo for Leo, the idolatrous biſhop of *Chalcedon*, who maintained his monſtrous ſyſtem with obſtinacy, and was, for that reaſon, ſent into baniſhment [*q*].

[*o*] See Cerularii *Epiſtola ad Johannem Tranenſem in Caniſii Lection. Antiq.* t. iii. p. 281. where the reader will alſo find the refutation of this letter by Cardinal Humbert. See likewiſe Cerularii *Epiſtola ad Petrum Antiochenſ.* in Cotelerii *Monumentis Eccleſiæ Græc.* tom. ii. p. 138. add to theſe Martene, *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 847.

[*p*] Σχετικῶς προσκυνοῦμεν, οὐ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας.

[*q*] An ample account of this whole matter is given by Anna Comnena, in her *Alexiad*, lib. v.

Controverſies in the Latin church about the Lord's ſupper.

XIII. The famous diſpute concerning the *preſence* of CHRIST's body and blood in the euchariſt was revived about the middle of this century in the Latin church. Hitherto the diſputants on both ſides had propoſed their jarring opinions with the utmoſt freedom, unreſtrained by the deſpotic voice of authority, ſince no council had given a definitive ſentence upon this matter, nor preſcribed a rule of faith to terminate all inquiry and debate [r]. Hence it was, that, in the beginning of this century, LEUTHERIC, archbiſhop of *Sens*, affirmed, in oppoſition to the general opinion of the times, that none but the ſincere and upright Chriſtian, none but ſaints and real believers, received the body of CHRIST in the holy ſacrament. This opinion, which was broached in the year 1004, was every way proper to excite rumours among the people; but theſe its natural effects were happily prevented by the influence of ROBERT, king of *France*, and the wiſe counſels of ſome prudent friends, who hindered the fanatical prelate from diſſeminating this whimſical invention [s]. It was not ſo eaſy to extinguiſh the zeal, or to ſtop the mouth of the famous BERENGER, principal of the public ſchool at *Tours*, and afterwards archbiſhop of *Angers*, a man of a moſt acute and ſubtile genius, and highly renowned both on account of his extenſive learning, and the exemplary ſanctity of his life and manners [t]. This eminent eccleſiaſtic maintained publicly, in the year 1045, the doctrine of JOHANNES SCOTUS, oppoſed warmly the monſtrous opinions of PASCHASIUS RADBERT, which were adapted to captivate a ſuperſtitious multitude by exciting their aſtoniſhment, and perſevered with a noble obſtinacy in teaching that the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of CHRIST in the euchariſt, but preſerved their natural and eſſential qualities, and were no more than figures and external ſymbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour. This wiſe and rational doctrine was no ſooner publiſhed, than it was oppoſed by certain doctors in *France* and *Germany*; but the Roman pontif LEO IX attacked it with peculiar vehemence and fury in the year 1050; and in two councils, the one aſſembled at *Rome*, and the other at *Vercelli*, had the doctrine of BERENGER ſolemnly condemned, and the book of SCOTUS, from which it was drawn, committed to the flames. This example was followed by the council of *Paris*, which was ſummoned the very ſame year by HENRY I, and in which BERENGER, and his numerous adherents, were menaced with all ſorts of evils, both ſpiritual and temporal.

---

p. 104. lib. vii. p 158. edit. *Venet*.—The acts of this council, the very mention of which is omitted by ſeveral hiſtorians of conſiderable note, are publiſhed by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Coiſliniana*, p. 103.

[r] The various opinions concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, that were embraced during this century, are collected by MARTENE from an ancient manuſcript, and publiſhed in his *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur*. tom. ii. p. 126.

[s] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ* tom. i. p. 354.

[t] See the *Life* of BERENGER in the *Works* of HILDEBERT, archdeacon of *Mans*, p. 1324.—See alſo *Hiſt. Litter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 197.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 304. and the authors mentioned by FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. med. ævi*, tom. i. p. 570. It is probably by a preſs-error, that HILDEBERT is ſtyled *archbiſhop*, inſtead of *archdeacon*, by PARIS *Hiſt.* lib. i. p. 10. edit. *Watts*.

Theſe threats were executed, in part, againſt this unhappy prelate, whom Henry deprived of all his revenues; but neither threatnings, nor fines, nor ſynodical decrees could ſhake the firmneſs of his mind, or engage him to renounce the doctrine he had embraced.

The pontifs ſtrive, in vain, to put an end to this debate.

XIV. After theſe proceedings the controverſy was for ſome years happily ſuſpended, and Berenger, whoſe patrons were as numerous, as his enemies were formidable [u], enjoyed, for a while the ſweets of liberty and peace. His enemies, however, after the death of Leo IX, rekindled the flame of religious diſcord, and perſuaded his ſucceſſor Victor II to examine anew the doctrine of Berenger. The pontif complied and ſent his legates to two different councils that were aſſembled at *Tours*, in the year 1054 [*w*], for that purpoſe. In one of theſe councils the famous Hildebrand, who was afterwards pontif under the title of Gregory VII, appeared in the character of legate, and oppoſed the new doctrine with the utmoſt vehemence. Berenger was alſo preſent at this aſſembly, and, overpowered with threats, rather than convinced by reaſon and argument, he not only abandoned his opinions, but (if we may believe his adverſaries, to whoſe teſtimony we are confined in this matter) abjured them ſolemnly, and, in conſequence of this humbling ſtep, made his peace with the church. This abjuration, however, was far from being ſincere, and the docility of Berenger was no more than an act of diſſimulation; for ſoon after this period, he taught anew, though with more circumſpection and prudence, the opinions he had formerly profeſſed. That his conduct here appears mean and diſhoneſt, is indeed evident; but we are not ſufficiently acquainted with the tranſactions of theſe councils to fix preciſely the degree of his crime.

XV. The account of Berenger's perfidy being brought to Nicolas II, the exaſperated pontif ſummoned him to *Rome* A. D. 1058, and terrified him, in ſuch a manner, in the council held there the following year, that he declared his readineſs to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that venerable aſſembly ſhould think proper to impoſe upon his faith. Humbert was accordingly appointed unanimouſly by Nicolas and the council to draw up a confeſſion of faith for Berenger, who ſigned it publicly, and confirmed his adherence to it by a ſolemn oath. In this confeſſion there was, among other tenets equally abſurd, the following declaration, that *the bread and wine, after conſecration, were not only a* sacrament, *but alſo the* real body and blood of Jesus Christ; *and that this body and blood* were handled by the prieſts and *conſumed by the faithful, and not in a ſacramental ſenſe, but in reality and truth, as other ſenſible objects are.* This doctrine was ſo monſtrouſly nonſenſical, and was ſuch an impudent inſult upon the very firſt principles of reaſon, that it could have nothing alluring to a man of Berenger's acute and philoſophical turn, nor could it poſſibly become the object of his ſerious belief, as appeared ſoon after this odious act of diſſimulation; for no ſooner was he returned into *France*, than taking refuge in the countenance and protection of his ancient patrons, he expreſſed the utmoſt deteſtation and abhorrence of the doctrines he had been obliged to profeſs at *Rome*, abjured them ſolemnly both in his diſcourſe and in his writings, and returned zealouſly to the profeſſion and defence of his former, which had always been his real, opinion. ALEXANDER II employed the ſeducing influence of ſoft and friendly expoſtulation to engage BERENGER to diſſemble anew, or, in other words, to return from his pretended apoſtaſy; but his remonſtrances were ineffectual, and that perhaps in a great meaſure, becauſe this rebellious ſon of a ſuperſtitious church was powerfully ſupported in the maintenance of his opinions. Hence the controverſy was prolonged, during many years, by a multitude of writings on both ſides of the queſtion, and the followers of BERENGER increaſed from day to day.

---

[u] His moſt formidable enemy and rival was Lanfranc, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*.

[(*w*) Other hiſtorians mention but one council, and place it in the year 1055.]

XVI. GREGORY VII, whoſe enterprizing ſpirit no difficulties nor oppoſitions could diſcourage, was no ſooner raiſed to the pontificate than he undertook to terminate this important controverſy, and, for that purpoſe, ſent an order to BERENGER, in the year 1078, to repair to *Rome*. Conſidering the natural character of this pontif, his conduct in this affair was highly laudable, and diſcovered a degree of impartiality and candour, which his proceedings upon other occaſions gave little reaſon to expect. He ſeems to have had a high eſteem for BERENGER, and in the particular points in which he was obliged to oppoſe him, he did it with all poſſible mildneſs, and with a tenderneſs which ſhewed that he acted rather from a forced compliance with the clamours of his adverſaries, than from inclination or principle. In the council that was held at *Rome* towards the concluſion of the year 1078, he permitted BERENGER to draw up a new confeſſion of his faith, and to renounce that which had been compoſed by HUMBERT, though it had been ſolemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II and a Roman council. The ſagacious pontif perceived clearly the abſurdity of HUMBERT's confeſſion, and therefore revoked it, though it had been rendered ſacred by papal authority [x]. In conſequence of this, the perſecuted prelate made a ſecond declaration confirmed by an oath, that he would adhere for the future to the following propoſitions: That *the bread laid upon the altar became, after conſecration, the true body of* CHRIST, *which was born of the Virgin, ſuffered on the croſs, and now ſits at the right-hand of the Father:* and that the *wine placed upon the altar, became, after conſecration, the true blood, which flowed from the ſide of* CHRIST. The pontif was ſatisfied with this declaration, which was far from producing the ſame effect upon the enemies of BERENGER; they ſhewed that it was ambiguous, and ſo it was in reality, and they inſiſted that BERENGER ſhould be obliged not only to ſign another declaration leſs vague and equivocal, but ſhould alſo be required to prove his ſincerity by the fiery trial. GREGORY refuſed abſolutely this latter demand, and would have equally refuſed the other, had not his favorable intentions towards BERENGER yielded to the importunate clamours of his enemies and perſecutors.

---

[x] It is worthy of obſervation, that GREGORY VII, whoſe zeal in extending the juriſdiction and exalting the authority of the Roman pontifs ſurpaſſed that of all his predeceſſors, acknowledged, at leaſt tacitly, by this ſtep, that a pope and council might err, and had erred in effect. How otherwiſe could he allow BERENGER to renounce a confeſſion of faith, that had been ſolemnly approved and confirmed by NICOLAS II, and a Roman council?

XVII. The pontif, therefore, granted that part of their demand that related to a new declaration, and, in a council held at *Rome* A. D. 1079, had a third confeſſion of faith drawn up, which was ſomewhat leſs abſurd than the firſt, though much more harſh than the ſecond, and to which BERENGER, after reading and ſubſcribing it in the midſt of the aſſembly, was obliged to declare his aſſent by a ſolemn oath. By this aſſent he profeſſed to believe, *That the bread and wine were, by the myſterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our redeemer, ſubſtantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of* JESUS CHRIST: and to remove all grounds of ſuſpicion, to diſpel all doubt about the reality of his attachment to this ridiculous ſyſtem, he added to his ſecond confeſſion [y] a ſolemn declaration, that *the bread and wine, after conſecration, were converted into the real body and blood of* CHRIST, *not only in quality of external ſigns and ſacramental repreſentations, but in their eſſential properties, and in ſubſtantial reality.* No ſooner had BERENGER made this ſtrange declaration, than the pontif redoubled the marks of eſteem which he had formerly ſhewn him, and ſent him back to his country loaded with the moſt honourable teſtimonies of his liberality and friendſhip. The doubleminded doctor did not, however, think himſelf bound by this declaration ſolemn as it was; and therefore retracted publicly, upon his return to his reſidence, what he had ſubſcribed as his real ſentiments in the council of *Rome*, and went even ſo far as to compoſe an elaborate refutation of the doctrine to which he had been engaged to profeſs his aſſent. This new change excited a warm and vehement controverſy, in which LANFRANC and GUITMUND endeavoured to perplex BERENGER with their ſophiſtry, and to overwhelm him with their invectives. GREGORY VII, to whoſe papal thunder the affronted council looked with impatience, ſeemed neither ſurprized nor offended by the inconſtancy of BERENGER, nor did he take any ſtep which could teſtify the ſmalleſt mark of reſentment againſt this pretended apoſtate. From hence it appears more than probable, that the ſecond confeſſion of BERENGER had entirely ſatisfied that pontif, and that the violent impoſition of the third was by no means agreeable to GREGORY, who ſeems to have adopted, in a great meaſure, if not wholly, the ſentiments of BERENGER [z].

---

[y] Mentioned in the preceding ſection.

[z] A remarkable treatiſe of BERENGER's compoſition, which has been publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. iv. p. 99. 109. will contribute to caſt a ſatisfactory light upon this whole affair, and will fully unfold the real ſentiments of GREGORY concerning the euchariſt. For from this piece it is undoubtedly evident; *1ſt*, That BERENGER was eſteemed and favoured, in a ſingular manner, by GREGORY VII. *2dly*, That this pontif was of the ſame opinion with BERENGER concerning the euchariſt; it is certain, at leaſt, that he was for adhering to the words of ſcripture in this matter, and was eager in ſuppreſſing all curious reſearches and all poſitive deciſions concerning the manner of CHRIST's preſence in the holy ſacrament. This appears evidently from the following words, which he addreſſed to BERENGER before the meeting of the laſt council of *Rome*, and in which he ſpeaks of his deſign to conſult the Virgin MARY concerning the conduct which it was proper for him to obſerve in the courſe of this controverſy: *Ego plane te* (ſays the pontif in the 108th page of the work, cited in the beginning of this note) *de Chriſti ſacrificio ſecundum*

Berenger's fate, and the progreſs of his doctrine.

XVIII. Amidſt the clamours of his incenſed adverſaries, **BERENGER** obſerved a profound ſilence, and was prudent enough to return no anſwer to their bitter and repeated invectives. Fatigued with a controverſy, in which the firſt principles of reaſon were ſo impudently inſulted, and exhauſted by an oppoſition which he was unable to overcome, he abandoned all his worldly concerns, and retired to the iſle of *St. Coſme*, in the neighbourhood of *Tours*, where he ſpent the remainder of his days in faſting, prayer, and pious exerciſes. In the year 1088, death put an end to the afflicton he ſuffered in his retirement, from a bitter reflection upon the diſſimulation he had been guilty of at *Rome*, and to the penitential acts of mortification and auſterity, to which he ſeems to have ſubmitted with a deſign to expiate the enormity of his criminal compliance, and the guilt of his perjury [*a*]. He left behind him in the minds of the people a deep impreſſion of his extraordinary ſanctity, and his followers were as numerous as his fame was illuſtrious [*b*].

ſcripturas bene ſentire non dubito: tamen quia conſuetudinis mihi eſt, ad B. Mariam de his quæ movent recurrere—impoſui religioſo cuidam amico—a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret, ſed verbis commendaret, quorſum me de negotio quod in manibus habebam de Chriſti ſacrificio reciperem, in quo immotus perſiſterem. We ſee here plainly, that GREGORY expreſſes the ſtrongeſt propenſity to the ſentiments of **BERENGER**, not, however, without ſome heſitation concerning the manner in which he was to conduct himſelf, and alſo concerning the preciſe doctrine, which it was neceſſary to embrace in relation to the preſence of CHRIST in the euchariſt. It was this heſitation which led him to conſult the Virgin MARY, whoſe anſwer the pontif gives in the following words: *A. B. Maria audivit et ad me retulit, nihil de ſacrificio Chriſti cogitandum, nihil eſſe tenendum, niſi quod tenerent authenticæ ſcripturæ, contra quas* BERENGARIUS *nihil habebat. Hoc tibi manifeſtare volui, ut ſecuriorem ad nos fiduciam et alacriorem ſpem habeas* Here we ſee an anſwer of the Virgin pronouncing that it was neceſſary to adhere to the expreſs declarations of ſcripture concerning the preſence of CHRIST in the ſacrament; and whether GREGORY was fanatical enough to confide in this anſwer as real, or rogue enough to forge it, it is ſtill certain, that he confined his belief concerning the point in debate to the language of ſcripture, and held that the true body and blood of CHRIST were exhibited in the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, though it was neither neceſſary nor expedient to inquire into the nature or manner of this myſterious preſence. *3dly*, It appears manifeſt from the treatiſe already mentioned, that the aſſembling of the ſecond council, and the impoſition of another confeſſion of faith upon the conſcience of BERENGER, were meaſures into which GREGORY was forced by the enemies of that eccleſiaſtic. *Dejectus eſt*, ſays BERENGER, ſpeaking of that pontif, *importunitate Paduani ſcurræ, non epiſcopi, et Piſani non epiſcopi, ſed antichriſti . . . ut permitteret calumniatoribus veritatis in poſteriori quadrageſimali concilio ſcriptum a ſe firmatum in priori mutari.* *4thly*, We ſee here the true reaſon why GREGORY ſhewed not the ſmalleſt mark of reſentment againſt BERENGER, when, upon his return to his own country, he violated the promiſe by which he had ſo ſolemnly bound himſelf in the laſt council, and refuted the confeſſion to which he had ſworn his aſſent. For the pontif was very far from adopting the ſentiments of thoſe who had drawn up, or ſuggeſted that monſtrous confeſſion, and eſteemed it ſufficient to believe with BERENGER, that the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST were exhibited to Chriſtians in the euchariſt. Hence he let the violent adverſaries of his perſecuted friend murmur, ſcribble, bawl, and refute, while he himſelf obſerved a profound ſilence, and perſiſted in his reſolution to put that unhappy man to no farther trouble It is, however, proper to obſerve, that in the ſame book, from whence theſe particulars are taken, we find BERENGER addreſſing himſelf, with the utmoſt humility, to the divine mercy for the pardon of the crime of diſſimulation and perjury he had committed at *Rome*; and confeſſing that the fear of death had extorted from him oaths and declarations diametrically oppoſite to his real ſentiments, and engaged him to ſubſcribe to a ſet of tenets which he abhorred. *Deus omnipotens*, ſays he, *miſerere, fons miſericordiarum, tantum ſacrilegium agnoſcenti.*

[*a*] This will appear evident to ſuch as peruſe the treatiſe of his compoſition, which we have mentioned in the preceding note, as publiſhed in MARTENE'S *Theſaur Anecdot.* tom. iv. p. 109.

[*b*] The canons of the cathedral of *Tours* continue to honour the memory of BERENGER by an

There have been diſputes among the learned about the real ſentiments of this eminent man: yet, notwithſtanding the art which he ſometimes uſed to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expreſſions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention ſuch of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive, that he looked upon the bread and wine in the ſacrament as no more than the ſigns or ſymbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour [*c*]. In this opinion BERENGER perſevered to the laſt, nor have we any authentic proof of his having departed from it before his death, as ſome of the Roman catholic writers vainly pretend [*d*].

---

annual proceſſion, in which they perform a ſolemn ſervice at his tomb in the iſle of *St. Coſme*. See MOLEON, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 130.

[*c*] MABILLON and other Roman catholic writers, as alſo a few Lutheran divines, are of opinion, that BERENGER denied only the doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*, while he maintained, at the ſame time, the real preſence of the body and blood of CHRIST in the euchariſt. And this opinion will, indeed, appear plauſible to ſuch as conſider only the declaration he ſigned in the firſt council at *Rome*, to which he was ſummoned by GREGORY VII, and which he never retracted, without comparing this declaration with the reſt of his writings. On the other hand, USHER, BASNAGE, and almoſt all the writers of the reformed church maintain, that the doctrine of BERENGER was exactly the ſame with that which CALVIN afterwards adopted; and I cannot help joining with them in this opinion, when I peruſe attentively the following words of his *Letter* to ALMANNUS, publiſhed in MARTENE's *Theſaur.* tom. iv. p. 109. *Conſtat*, ſays BERENGER in expreſs terms, *verum Chriſti corpus in ipſa menſa proponi*, SED SPIRITUALITER INTERIORI HOMINI VERUM *in ea Chriſti corpus ab his duntaxat, qui Chriſti membra ſunt, incorruptum, intaminatum, inattritumque* SPIRITUALITER MANDUCARI. Theſe words demonſtrate ſo clearly, that, by the *preſence* of CHRIST's body in the euchariſt, BERENGER meant no more than a *ſpiritual preſence*, that they diſpel all doubt about his real ſentiments, though, upon other occaſions, he concealed theſe ſentiments under dubious expreſſions to deceive his adverſaries.

[*d*] It is well known what laborious efforts the Roman catholic writers have employed to perſuade us, that BERENGER, before his death, abandoned the opinion he had ſo long and ſo warmly defended, and returned to the doctrine of the church of *Rome* concerning the corporal preſence of CHRIST in the euchariſt. But when we inquire into the reaſons on which this aſſertion is founded, we ſhall immediately perceive their weakneſs and inſufficiency. They alledge, in the firſt place, that BERENGER *gave an account of his doctrine and belief* in the council of *Bourdeaux*, A. D. 1087; and add to this, that the ancient writers applaud his penitential ſentiments, and affirm that he died in the catholic faith. In all this, however, we ſee no proof of BERENGER's retractation. He adhered, indeed, to the confeſſion of faith, which he had ſubſcribed and adopted in the firſt of the two Roman councils, to which he had been ſummoned by GREGORY VII, and which that pontif judged ſufficient to clear him from the imputation of hereſy; and they, who confined their attention to the *literal ſenſe* of the words of that confeſſion, without conſidering their *ſpirit*, and the different meanings of which they were ſuſceptible, might eaſily imagine that BERENGER's confeſſion was agreeable to the doctrine of the church. GREGORY, in order to pacify matters, confirmed them in this notion; and though he was well informed of BERENGER's having retracted the confeſſion which he had ſigned in the laſt Roman council before which he appeared, and of his oppoſing, with the utmoſt warmth, the opinion he had there ſo ſolemnly profeſſed, yet he let the inconſtant doctor remain unmoleſted, and thereby tacitly acquitted him of the crime and the error that were laid to his charge.

It is of the utmoſt importance to obſerve here, that the Roman church was not come, in this century, to a fixed determination concerning the *nature* and *manner* of CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt. This appears moſt evidently from the three confeſſions which BERENGER ſigned by the order of three councils, which confeſſions differed from each other, not only in the terms and the turn of expreſſion, but alſo in the opinions and doctrines they contained. Pope NICOLAS II, and the council he aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 1059, obliged him to ſubſcribe, as the true and orthodox doctrine of the church, the firſt of theſe confeſſions, which was compoſed by Cardinal HUMBERT. This confeſſion was, however, rejected, not only as harſh in point of expreſſion, but alſo as er-

A controverſy concerning Martial.

XIX. It is not rare to find in the hiſtory of the church the moſt trifling objects exciting the warmeſt and moſt vehement controverſies. Such was the diſpute that aroſe in *France*, in the year 1023, between the prieſts and monks of *Limoges*, concerning the place that was to be aſſigned in the public liturgy to MARTIAL, the firſt biſhop of that dioceſe. One party headed by JORDAN, biſhop of *Limoges*, were for placing him among the *confeſſors*; while HUGO, abbot of the monaſtery of *St. Martial*, maintained, that the prelate in queſtion was to be ranked among the *apoſtles*, and branded, with the opprobrious and heretical title of *Ebionites*, all ſuch as adhered to the propoſal of JORDAN. This *momentous* affair was debated firſt, in a council held at *Poitiers* in the year 1023, and in another aſſembled at *Paris* the year following, in which latter it was determined, that MARTIAL was to be honoured with the title of an *apoſtle*, and that all who refuſed him this eminent rank were to be conſidered as Ebionites, who, as is well known, confined the number of the apoſtles to twelve, that they might exclude St. PAUL from that ſacred order. The decree, however, of this council did not produce the effects that were expected from it; for it exaſperated inſtead of calming the zeal and animoſity of the contending parties, ſo that this miſerable diſpute

---

roneous and unſound, by GREGORY and the two Roman councils, which he had expreſly ſummoned to inquire into that matter; for had HUMBERT's declaration appeared to the pontif to be a juſt expreſſion of the doctrine and ſenſe of the church concerning the euchariſt, neither he nor the ſucceeding councils would have permitted other forms of doctrine to be ſubſtituted in its place. GREGORY, as we have already ſeen, was of opinion, that it was highly improper to pry with too much curioſity into the myſteries of the euchariſt, and that, laying aſide all diſputes concerning the *manner* of CHRIST's preſence in that holy inſtitution, it was ſafeſt to adhere to the plain words of ſcripture; and as this was alſo the opinion of BERENGER, and was plainly expreſſed in his confeſſion of faith, the judicious pontif pronounced him innocent. But a following council departed from this equitable ſentence of GREGORY, who, though with much reluctance, was induced to confirm their rigorous deciſions; and hence aroſe a third confeſſion, which was extremely different from the two preceding ones. We may remark by the by, that in this controverſy the councils ſeem plainly to have ſwayed the pontifs, ſince we ſee the obſtinate, the invincible GREGORY yielding, againſt his will, to one of theſe clamorous aſſemblies. BERENGER had no ſooner got out of the hands of his enemies, than he returned to the ſecond confeſſion, which the pontif had approved, and publicly declaimed againſt that which had been impoſed upon him in the laſt Roman council before which he had appeared, without receiving the leaſt mark of diſapprobation from GREGORY. From this it was natural to conclude, that, although he oppoſed the decree of that council, he adopted nevertheleſs the opinion of the pope and of the church.

In the account which I have here given of this memorable controverſy, I have not only conſulted the ancient records relating to that matter, which have been made public (for ſeveral of them lie as yet in MSS in the cabinets of the curious) but have alſo been aſſiſted by the labours of thoſe among the learned, who have treated that important branch of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory in the moſt ample and accurate manner: ſuch as firſt, FRANC. DE ROYE's book, publiſhed at *Angers* in the year 1656; *Ad Can. Ego Berengarius* 41. *de conſecrat. diſtinct.* 2. *Ubi vita, hæreſis, et pœnitentia Berengarii Andegavenſis Archidiaconi et ad Joſephi locum de Chriſto* (a book which is extremely curious, and very little known). MABILLON's *Præfat. ad* tom. ix. *Act. SS. Ord. Bened. Seu Sæc.* vi. part. II. p. 4. *et Diſſert. de multiplici damnatione, fidei profeſſione et lapſu*, which is publiſhed in his *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 456. DE BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 404. tom. ii. p. 452. The authors of the reformed church, which I have followed in this controverſy, are, USSERIUS *De ſucceſſione Eccleſiar. Chriſtianar. in occidente*, cap. vii. § 24 p. 195.—BASNAGE *Hiſt. des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. p. 105. *et Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, tom. ii. p. 1391.—CAS. OUDIN. *Diſſert. de Doctrina et Scriptis Berengarii in Comment. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ii. p. 624. There appears more or leſs a certain ſpirit of partiality in all theſe writers; but this ſpirit is particularly notorious among thoſe of the church of *Rome*.

became daily more univerſal, and ſpred like a contagion through all the provinces of *France*. The matter was, at length, brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontif, JOHN XIX, who decided it in favour of the monks, and, in a letter addreſſed to JORDAN and the other biſhops of the nation, pronounced MARTIAL worthy of the title and honours of an apoſtle. This deciſion produced the moſt ſubſtantial and permanent effects: for in a council aſſembled at *Limoges* A. D. 1029, JORDAN declared his acquieſcence in the papal ſentence; in a provincial council at *Bourges*, two years after, MARTIAL was aſſociated to the company of the apoſtles with great ſolemnity in conſequence of the deciſion of the Roman ſee, and about the ſame time this controverſy was completely and finally terminated in a numerous council aſſembled at *Limoges*, in which the prayers that had been conſecrated to the memory of the apoſtle MARTIAL by the zealous pontif were publicly recited [e]. The warm contenders for the apoſtleſhip of MARTIAL, aſſerted that he was one of the ſeventy diſciples of CHRIST; from whence they concluded that he had an equal title with PAUL and BARNABAS to the honour of an apoſtle.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

I. THE form of public worſhip, which was eſtabliſhed at *Rome*, had not, as yet, been univerſally received in the weſtern provinces. This was looked upon by the imperious pontifs as an inſult upon their authority, and therefore they uſed their utmoſt efforts to introduce the Roman ceremonies every where, and to promote a perfect uniformity of worſhip in every part of the Latin world. GREGORY VII employed all his diligence, activity, and zeal in this enterprize, as appears from ſeveral paſſages in his letters, and he perhaps alone was equal to the execution of ſuch an arduous attempt. The Spaniards had long diſtinguiſhed themſelves above all other nations by the noble and reſolute reſiſtance they made to the deſpotic attempts of the popes upon this occaſion; for they adhered to their ancient *gothic* liturgy [f] with the utmoſt obſtinacy, and could not be brought to change it for the method of worſhip eſtabliſhed at *Rome*. ALEXANDER II had indeed proceeded ſo far, in the year 1068, as to perſuade the inhabitants of *Arragon* into his meaſures [g], and, to conquer the averſion which the Catalonians had diſcovered for the Roman worſhip. But the honour of finiſhing this difficult work, and bringing it to perfection, was reſerved for GREGORY VII, who, without interruption, exhorted, threatned, admoniſhed, and entreated SANCIUS and ALPHONSO, the kings of *Arragon* and *Caſtile*, until, fatigued with the importunity of this reſtleſs pontif, they conſented to aboliſh the Gothic ſervice in their churches, and to introduce the Roman in its place. SANCIUS was the firſt, who complied with the requeſt of the ambitious pontif, and, in the year 1080, his example was followed by ALPHONSO. The methods which the nobles of *Caſtile* employed to decide the matter were very extraordinary. Firſt, they choſe two champions who were to determine the controverſy by ſingle combat, the one fighting for the Roman liturgy, the other for the Gothic. This firſt trial ended in favour of the latter; for the Gothic hero proved victorious. The fiery trial was next made uſe of to terminate the diſpute; the Roman and Gothic liturgies were committed to the flames, which, as the ſtory goes, conſumed the former, while the latter remained unblemiſhed and entire. Thus were the Gothic rites crowned with a double victory, which, however, was not ſufficient to maintain them againſt the authority of the pope, and the influence of the queen CONSTANTIA, who determined ALPHONSO in favour of the Roman ſervice [h].

---

[e] See BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 372. 101.—J. LONGEVAL, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. vii. p. 188, 189. 231.—The Benedictine monks, in their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. *Append. Documentor.* p. 162. have publiſhed the *Letter of* JORDAN *to Pope* BENEDICT VIII, *againſt the Apoſtleſhip of Martial.* The decrees of the councils of *Bourges* and *Limoges* concerning this matter are publiſhed by LABBE, in his *Biblioth. Nova Manuſcriptor.* tom. ii. p. 766. MABILLON has given an ample account of ADEMAR, a monk of *St. Cybar*, the firſt promoter of this ridiculous controverſy, in his *Annal. Ord. S. Benedict.* tom. iv. p. 318. and, among the original papers ſubjoined to that volume, has publiſhed a letter wrote by that monk in favour of the apoſtleſhip of MARTIAL. See alſo the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 301.

[f] See MABILLON, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 10.—JO. BONA, *Rerum Liturgicarum* lib. i. cap. xi. p. 220. Opp.—PETR. LE BRUN, *Explication des Ceremonies de la Maſſe*, tom. ii. *Diſſ.* v. p. 272.

Divine worſhip performed in an unknown and foreign tongue.

II. The zeal of the Roman pontifs for introducing a uniformity of worſhip into the weſtern churches may be, in ſome meaſure, juſtified; but their not permitting every nation to celebrate divine worſhip in their mother tongue was abſolutely inexcuſable. While, indeed, the Latin language was in general uſe among the weſtern nations, or, at leaſt, was unknown to but a very ſmall number, there was no reaſon why it ſhould not be employed in the public ſervice of the church. But when the decline of the Roman empire drew on by degrees the extinction of its language in ſeveral places, and its decay in all the weſtern provinces, it became juſt and reaſonable that each people ſhould ſerve the Deity in the language they underſtood, and which was peculiar to them. This reaſoning, however evident and ſtriking, had no ſort of influence upon the Roman pontifs, who neither in this, nor in the following centuries, could be perſuaded to change the eſtabliſhed cuſtom, but perſiſted, on the contrary, with the moſt ſenſeleſs obſtinacy, in retaining the uſe of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worſhip, even when it was no longer underſtood by the people [i]. This ſtrange conduct has been variouſly accounted for by different writers, who have tortured their inventions to find out its ſecret reaſons, and have imagined many that ſeem extremely improbable and far fetched. A ſuperſtitious and extravagant veneration for whatever carried the hoary aſpect of a remote antiquity, was undoubtedly the principal reaſon that rendered the pontifs unwilling to aboliſh the uſe of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worſhip. The ſame abſurd principle produced a ſimilar effect in the eaſtern churches; thus the Egyptian Chriſtians perform their religious ſervice in the language of ancient Copts, the Jacobites and the Neſtorians in the Syriac, and the Abyſſinians in the old Æthiopic, though all theſe languages have been long ſince obſolete, and are thereby become abſolutely unintelligible to the multitude [k].

---

[g] PETR. DE MARCA, *Hiſtoire de Bearn*, liv. ii. cap. ix.

[h] BONA, *Rerum Liturgicar.* lib. i. cap. xi. p. 216.—LE BRUN, *loc. citat.* p. 292.—JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſt. de l'Eſpagne*, tom. iii. p. 237. 241. 246.

[i] USSERIUS, *Hiſtoria Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis ab* HEN. WHARTONO *edita et aucta*, *Londini* 1690, in 4to.

Ceremonies multiplied.

III. It would be tedious to enumerate in a circumſtantial manner the new inventions that were impoſed upon Chriſtians, in this century, under the ſpecious titles of piety, and zeal, by the ſuperſtitious deſpotiſm of an imperious clergy. It would be alſo endleſs to mention the additions that were made to former inventions, the multiplication, for example, of the rites and ceremonies that were uſed in the worſhip of ſaints, relics, and images, and the new directions that were adminiſtred to ſuch as undertook pilgrimages, or other ſuperſtitious ſervices of that nature. We ſhall only obſerve, that, during the whole of this century, all the European nations were moſt diligently employed in rebuilding, repairing, and adorning their churches [l]. Nor will this appear ſurprizing when we conſider, that, in the preceding century, all *Europe* was alarmed with a diſmal apprehenſion that the *day of judgment* was at hand, and that the world was approaching to its final diſſolution; for, among the other effects of this panic terror, the churches and monaſteries were ſuffered to fall into ruin, or at leaſt to remain without repair, from a notion that they would ſoon be involved in the general fate of all ſublunary things. But when theſe apprehenſions were removed, things immediately put on a new face; the tottering temples were rebuilt, and the greateſt zeal attended with the richeſt and moſt liberal donations, was employed in reſtoring the ſacred edifices to their former luſtre, or rather in giving them new degrees of magnificence and beauty.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Ancient ſects.

I. THE ſtate of the ancient ſects, and particularly of the Neſtorians and Monophyſites, who reſided in *Aſia* and *Egypt* under the Mahometan government, was now much the ſame that it had been in the preceding century, neither extremely proſperous, nor abſolutely miſerable. The caſe of the Manichæans, or Paulicians, whom the Grecian emperors had baniſhed from the eaſtern provinces into *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, was much more unhappy, on account of the perpetual conflicts they had to ſuſtain with the

Manichæans.

---

[k] See EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Diſſertat. de Liturgiarum Oriental. origine et antiquitate*, cap. vi. p. 40.

[l] GLABER RODULPHUS, *Hiſt.* lib. iii. cap. iv. in DUCHESNE's *Scriptor. Franc.* tom. iv. p. 217. *Infra milleſimum tertio jam fere imminente anno contigit in univerſo pœne terrarum orbe, præcipue tamen in Italia et in Galliis, innovari Eccleſiarum baſilicas.*

Greeks, who perſecuted and oppreſſed them with much keeneſs and animoſity. The Greeks, as uſually happens upon like occaſions, laid the blame of their violent meaſures upon the Manichæans, whom they repreſented as a turbulent, perfidious, and ſanguinary faction, and as the declared and inveterate enemies of the Grecian empire [*m*]. This, however, is by no means to be received as an impartial ſtate of the caſe; at leaſt, it appears from many circumſtances, that if the Manichæans were exaſperated againſt the Greeks, their reſentment was owing to the violent and injurious treatment they had received from them. The Grecian pontifs and clergy were far from being deſtitute of the odious ſpirit of perſecution, and it is certain that the emperors, inſtigated and ſet on by them, had exhauſted the patience of the Paulicians by repeated cruelties and vexations, and alienated their affections by inflicting upon them, without interruption, a variety of puniſhments, ſuch as baniſhment, confiſcation of goods, and other ſuch marks of ſeverity and violence.

ALEXIUS COMNENUS, who, by his learning, was an ornament to the imperial ſcepter, perceiving that the Manichæans were not to be vanquiſhed, without the greateſt difficulty, by the force of arms, and obſerving alſo that their numbers increaſed from day to day both in *Thrace* and in the adjacent provinces, had recourſe to the power of reaſon and argument to conquer their obſtinacy, and ſpent whole days at *Philippopolis*, in diſputing with the principal doctors of that pernicious ſect. Many of them yielded to the victorious arguments of this royal diſputant, and his learned aſſociates; nor is this to be ſo much wondered at, ſince their demonſtrations were accompanied and enforced by rewards and puniſhments. Such of the Manichæans, as retracted their errors and returned to the boſom of the Greek church, were loaded with gifts, honours, and privileges according to their reſpective ſtations, while ſuch as ſtood firm againſt the reaſoning of the emperor, were inhumanly condemned to perpetual impriſonment [*n*].

An account of the Paulicians in *Europe*.

II. Many of the Paulicians, either from a principle of zeal for the propagation of their opinions, or from a deſire of getting rid of the perſecution and oppreſſion they ſuffered under the Grecian yoke, retired from *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, and formed ſettlements in other countries. Their firſt migration was into *Italy*; from whence in proceſs of time, they ſent colonies into almoſt all the other provinces of *Europe*, and formed gradually a conſiderable number of religious aſſemblies who adhered to their doctrine, and who were afterwards perſecuted with the utmoſt vehemence by the Roman pontifs [*o*].

[*m*] ANNA COMNENA *Alexiados*, lib. v. p. 105. lib. vi. p. 124. 126. 145.

[*n*] There is an ample and circumſtantial account of this controverſy between the emperor and the Manichæans in the work mentioned in the preceding note, *Lib.* xiv. p. 357.

[*o*] See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiquitat. Ital. med. ævi*, tom. v. p. 83.—LIMBORCH, *Hiſtoria Inquiſitionis*, p. 31.—THOM. AUG. RICHINII *Diſſertatio de Catharis*, which is prefixed to the SUMMA B. MONETÆ *contra Catharos*, p. 17, 18. we might alſo refer upon this occaſion to GLABR. RODULPH *Hiſtor.* lib. iii. cap. viii. to MATTH. PARIS, and other ancient writers. Certain Italian authors, and among others RICHINI, ſeem unwilling to acknowledge, that the Paulicians arrived firſt in *Italy*, and proceeded from thence into the other provinces of *Europe*; and maintain, on the contrary, that their firſt ſettlement was in *France*, and that from thence they came

It is difficult to fix the preciſe period of time, when the Paulicians began to take refuge in *Europe*; it is, however, undoubtedly certain from the moſt authentic teſtimonies, that a conſiderable number of that ſect were, about the middle of this century, ſettled in *Lombardy*, *Inſubria*, and principally at *Milan*; and that many of them led a wandring life in *France*, *Germany*, and other countries, where they captivated the eſteem and admiration of the multitude by their ſanctimonious looks, and the uncommon air of piety, which they put on with much affectation. In *Italy* they were called *Paterini* and *Cathari*, or rather *Gazari*, which latter appellation the Germans have preſerved, with a ſmall alteration only, which was proper to adapt it to the genius of their language [p]. In *France* they were called *Albigenſes*, from the town of *Alby*, in the upper *Languedoc*, in Latin *Albigia* [q]. They were likewiſe called *Bulgarians*, in *France*, becauſe they came from *Bulgaria*, and becauſe the head of their ſect reſided in that country; as alſo *Publicans*, which was probably a corrupt pronunciation of *Paulicians*, and *boni homines* or *good men*, with ſeveral other titles and epithets [r].

---

into *Italy*. Theſe writers look upon it as ignominious to their country, to be conſidered as the firſt European nation which foſtered ſuch a pernicious and impious ſect in its boſom. Be that as it may, their hypotheſis is favoured by Petr. de Marca himſelf, a Frenchman, who, in his *Hiſtoire de Bearn*, livr. viii. cap. xiv. p. 728. declares it as his opinion, that the Paulicians joined themſelves to the Gallic armies, that returned from the *holy war* in *Paleſtine*, by the province of *Bulgaria*, and were thus conducted into *France*. But that learned author alledges no proof to ſupport this opinion: it appears, on the contrary, from the records of the *Inquiſition of Tholouſe*, publiſhed by Limborch, and from other authentic pieces, that the Paulicians ſettled firſt in *Sicily*, *Lombardy*, *Liguria*, and the *Milaneſe*, and ſent from thence their doctors and miſſionaries into *France*. See the *Codex Toloſanus*, p. 13, 14. 32. 68, 69. *& paſſim*. We learn alſo from the *Code of Tholouſe*, that the French Paulicians, who were called *Albigenſes*, had no biſhop to conſecrate their *Anciani* (ſuch was the title they gave to their preſbyters) ſo that ſuch of them as were deſirous of being placed in the order of preſbyters, were obliged to repair to *Italy* in order to their being regularly inſtalled.

[p] The title of *Paterini*, which was given to this ſect in *Italy*, has been already explained in the 2d Chapter, of the 2d Part of this Century, Sect. 13, Note [r]. As to the term *Catharus*, it was, undoubtedly, when applied to the Paulicians, the ſame with *Gazarus*, as I have elſewhere demonſtrated. See *Hiſtor. Ord. Apoſtol.* p. 367. The country, which bore, in this century, the name of *Gazaria*, was what we now call the *Leſſer Tartary*.

[q] That the Paulicians were called *Albigenſes* in *France*, and were a ſect entirely diſtinct from the *Waldenſes* and other heretics, appears evidently from the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*, already mentioned. They received this name from a town in *Aquitain*, called *Albigia*, or *Alby*, where their errors were condemned in a council held in the year 1176. See Chatel, *Memoires de l'Hiſtoire de Languedoc*, p. 305. It is, therefore, a miſtake to conſider the *Albigenſes*, as a ſect ſo called from *Alby's* being the place of their birth, their reſidence, or the ſeat of their principal aſſembly: ſince that name was given them for no other reaſon than their having been condemned in a council held in that town. There were, indeed, ſeveral Paulicians among the various ſects of diſſenters from the church of *Rome*, that inhabited the country about *Alby*; and it is alſo true, that the title of *Albigenſes* is uſually extended to all the heretics, of whatever ſect or denomination they were, who dwelt in theſe parts.

[r] The learned Du Fresne, in his *Gloſſarium Latin. medii ævi*, tom. 1. p. 1338. has proved in an ample manner, that the Paulicians were called, in *France*, *Bulgares*, and, by a corrupt pronunciation of that word, *Bougres*. The ſame author, in his *Obſervationes ad Villeharduini Hiſtoriam Conſtantinopolit.* p. 169. has fully demonſtrated, that the names *Popolicani* and *Publicani*, that were impoſed upon theſe Manichæans, were no more than a corruption of the term *Pauliciani* ill-pronounced. The appellation of *Boni Homines*, or *Los bos Homes*, as the ſouthern French ſpoke at that time, was a title which the Paulicians attributed to themſelves. See the *Codex Inquiſit. Toloſanæ*, p. 22. 84. 95, &c. and more eſpecially p. 131.

religious aſſemblies, ſuperſtitious and unlawful. 14. They denied, that the croſs on which CHRIST ſuffered was in any reſpect more ſacred than other kinds of wood, and, of conſequence, refuſed to pay to it the ſmalleſt degree of religious worſhip. 15. They not only refuſed all acts of adoration to the images of CHRIST, and of the ſaints, but were alſo for having them removed out of the churches. 16. They were ſhocked at the ſubordination and diſtinctions that were eſtabliſhed among the clergy, and at the different degrees of authority that were conferred upon the different members of that ſacred body [y].

When we conſider the corrupt ſtate of religion in this century, and particularly, the ſuperſtitious notions that were generally adopted in relation to outward ceremonies, the efficacy of pennance and the ſanctity of churches, relics, and images, it will not appear ſurprizing, that many perſons of good ſenſe and ſolid piety, running from one extreme to another, fell into the opinions of theſe Myſtics, in which, among ſeveral abſurdities, there were many things plauſible and ſpecious, and ſome highly rational.

The controverſy ſet on foot by Roſcellinus.

V. A controverſy, of a much more ſubtle and difficult nature, aroſe in *France* about the year 1089; and had for its principal author ROSCELLINUS, a canon of *Compiegne*, a profound dialectician, and the moſt eminent doctor of the ſect called *Nominaliſts*, which we have already had occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory. This ſubtile doctor held it inconceivable and impoſſible, that the ſon of God ſhould take on the human nature alone, *i. e.* without the Father and the holy Ghoſt becoming incarnate alſo, unleſs by the three perſons in the godhead were meant three diſtinct *objects*, or natures exiſting ſeparately (ſuch as three angels, or three diſtinct ſpirits) though endowed with one will, and acting by one power. When it was inſinuated to ROSCELLINUS, that this manner of reaſoning led directly to *Tritheiſm*, or the doctrine of three gods, he anſwered boldly: that the exiſtence of three gods might be aſſerted with truth [z], were not the expreſſion harſh and contrary to the phraſeology generally received. He was, however, obliged to retract this error in a council aſſembled at *Soiſſons*, in the year 1092; but he reſumed it when the council was diſmiſſed, and the danger over. Perſecuted anew on account of this doctrine, he took refuge in *England*, and excited there diviſions and conteſts of another kind, by maintaining, among other things, that perſons born out of lawful wedlock ought to be deemed incapable of admiſſion to holy orders. This doctrine, which was by no means ſuited to the times, procured ROSCELLINUS many enemies, and was in a great meaſure, the occaſion of his involuntary removal from *England*. Baniſhed thence, he returned to *France*, and, taking up his reſidence at *Paris*, he fomented again the old diſpute concerning the trinity. This, however, ſucceeded not according to his hopes, but expoſed him to much trouble and vexation from the redoubled attacks of his adverſaries, who preſſed hard on him from all quarters. Fatigued with their perſecutions, he retired at laſt to *Aquitain*, where he acquired univerſal eſteem by his eminent piety, and paſſed the reſt of his days in tranquillity and repoſe [a].

---

[y] See an account of the ſynod of *Arras* in DACHERIUS, *Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i. p. 607—624.—CAR. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 7.

[z] Such is the account given by JOHN, the accuſer of this metaphyſical eccleſiaſtic, in a letter to ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, publiſhed by BALUZIUS, in his *Miſcellanea*, tom. iv. p. 478. The ſame account is confirmed by ANSELM himſelf, in the book *De Fide Trinitatis*, which he wrote againſt ROSCELLINUS, ſee *Oper.* tom. i. p. 41. 43. & lib. ii. *Epiſtolar.* ep. xxxv. p. 355. tom. ii. Opp.—And alſo by FULCO, biſhop of *Beauvais*, as may be ſeen in the 2d book of the *Epiſtles of* ANSELM, ep. xli. lib. ii. tom. ii. Opp. p. 357.—It muſt, however, be conſidered, that the learned men now mentioned were the inveterate enemies of ROSCELLINUS, and that they perhaps comprehended his meaning imperfectly, or perverted it willingly. Several circumſtances prove that ſome of his adverſaries were in one or the other of theſe two caſes. ANSELM, himſelf, furniſhes ſufficient grounds for this ſuſpicion, ſince, notwithſtanding his averſion to the *Nominaliſts*, of whom ROSCELLINUS was the chief, he grants, in his book *De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. iii. p. 44. that the opinion of his antagoniſt may be admitted, or at leaſt tolerated, in a certain ſenſe, and even frequently intimates that he is not perfectly aſſured of his underſtanding fully the meaning of ROSCELLINUS, and that he believes the ſentiments of that eccleſiaſtic leſs pernicious than his accuſers have repreſented them. *Sed forſitan* (ſays ANSELM) *ipſe* (ROSCELLINUS) *non dicit, ſicut ſunt tres animæ aut tres* Angeli: *ſed ille, qui mihi ejus mandavit quæſtionem, hanc ex ſuo poſuit ſimilitudinem: ſed ſolummodo tres perſonas affirmat eſſe tres* RES, *ſine additamento alicujus ſimilitudinis.* The ſame ANSELM (*Epiſtolar.* lib. ii. ep. xli. p. 357.) declares, that the account which he had received of

---

the opinions of ROSCELLINUS appears to him extremely dubious, *Quod tamen* (ſays he) *abſque dubietate credere non poſſum*. From all this it is evident, that ANSELM was far from having an entire confidence in the equity and impartiality of the accuſers of ROSCELLINUS, or from looking upon that eccleſiaſtic as ſo black, as his enemies had endeavoured to make him.

As to the merits of the cauſe, it appears manifeſt to me, that this ſubtile diſpute was a conſequence of the warm controverſy, that ſubſiſted, in this century, between the *Realiſts* and the *Nominaliſts*. The former attacked the latter by the dangerous concluſions that ſeemed deducible from their principles, and reaſoned thus: "If, as your doctrine ſuppoſes, *univerſal ſubſtances* are no more than mere "*ſounds* or *denominations*, and the whole ſcience of logic is only converſant about words, it muſt of "neceſſity follow, that the three perſons in the Godhead, are only three NAMES, and not three "REALITIES OR THINGS. We deny the concluſion, replied ROSCELLINUS; the father, ſon, and "holy ghoſt, are not placed by us in the rank of DENOMINATIONS, but in the claſs of REALITIES "or THINGS." The ſubtile doctor here, as all muſt more or leſs do after him, by avoiding *Scylla* fell into *Charybdis*, and was charged, by his adverſaries, with the introduction of tritheiſm, by holding an opinion, that ſuppoſed the exiſtence of three divine ſubſtances. Were any of the writings of ROSCELLINUS now extant, they would help us, no doubt, to form a juſter notion of this controverſy than we can have at preſent.

[a] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. i. p. 485. 489.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 262.—*Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 358.—ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baronium, ad A.* 1094, tom. iv. p. 317.—JAQUES LONGUEVAL, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. viii. p. 59.

THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT. XII.

Several of the northern provinces receive the light of the goſpel.

I. A CONSIDERABLE part of *Europe* lay yet involved in Pagan darkneſs, which reigned more eſpecially in the northern provinces. It was, therefore, in theſe regions of gloomy ſuperſtition, that the zeal of the miſſionaries was principally exerted in this century; though their efforts were not all equally ſucceſsful, nor the methods they employed for the propagation of the goſpel equally prudent. BOLESLAUS, duke of *Poland*, having conquered the Pomeranians, offered them peace upon condition that they would receive the Chriſtian doctors, and permit them to exerciſe their miniſtry in that vanquiſhed province. This condition was accepted, and OTHO, biſhop of *Bamberg*, a man of eminent piety and zeal, was ſent, in the year 1124, to inculcate and explain the doctrines of Chriſtianity among that ſuperſtitious and barbarous people. Many were converted to the faith by his miniſtry, while great numbers ſtood firm againſt his moſt vigorous efforts, and perſiſted with an invincible obſtinacy in the religion of their idolatrous anceſtors. Nor was this the only mortification, which that illuſtrious prelate received in the execution of his pious enterprize; for, upon his return into *Germany*, many of thoſe, whom he had engaged in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, apoſtatized in his abſence, and relapſed into their ancient prejudices; this obliged OTHO to undertake a ſecond voyage into *Pomerania*, A. D. 1126, in which, after much oppoſition and difficulty, his labours were crowned with a happier iſſue, and contributed much to enlarge the bounds of the riſing church, and to eſtabliſh it upon ſolid foundations [a]. From this period, the Chriſtian religion ſeemed to acquire daily new degrees of ſtability among the Pomeranians; who could not be perſuaded hitherto to permit the ſettlement of a biſhop among them, but now received ADALBERT, or ALBERT, in that character, who was accordingly the firſt biſhop of *Pomerania*.

---

[a] See HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 34. where we find the life of OTHO, who, A. D. 1189, was canoniſed by CLEMENT III. See the *Acta Sanctor. menſis Julii*,

The Sclavonians and inhabitants of the iſle of *Rugen*.

II. Of all the northern princes in this century, none appeared with a more diſtinguiſhed luſtre than WALDEMAR I, king of *Denmark*, who acquired an immortal name by the glorious battles he fought againſt the Pagan nations, ſuch as the Sclavonians, Venedi, Vandals, and others, who either by their incurſions, or this revolt, drew upon them the weight of his victorious arm. He unſheathed his ſword not only for the defence and happineſs of his people, but alſo for the propagation and advancement of Chriſtianity; and wherever his arms were ſucceſsful, there he pulled down the temples and images of the gods, deſtroyed their altars, laid waſte their ſacred groves, and ſubſtituted in their place the Chriſtian worſhip, which deſerved to be propagated by better means than the ſword, by the authority of reaſon, rather than by the deſpotic voice of power. The iſland of *Rugen*, which lies in the neighbourhood of *Pomerania*, ſubmitted to the victorious arms of WALDEMAR, A. D. 1168; and its fierce and ſavage inhabitants, who were, in reality, no more than a band of robbers and pirates, were obliged, by that prince, to hear the inſtructions of the pious and learned doctors that followed his army, and to receive the Chriſtian worſhip. This ſalutary work was brought to perfection by ABSALOM, archbiſhop of *Lunden*, a man of a ſuperior genius, and of a moſt excellent character in every reſpect, whoſe eminent merit raiſed him to the ſummit of power, and engaged WALDEMAR to place him at the head of affairs [*b*].

The Finlanders.

III. The Finlanders received the goſpel in the ſame manner, in which it had been propagated among the inhabitants of the iſle of *Rugen*. They were alſo a fierce and ſavage people, who lived by plunder, and infeſted *Sweden* in a terrible manner by their perpetual incurſions, until, after many bloody battles, they were totally defeated by ERIC IX, and were, in conſequence thereof reduced under the Swediſh yoke. Hiſtorians differ about the preciſe time when this conqueſt was completed [*c*]; but they are all unanimous in their

---

tom. i. p. 349.—DAN. CRAMERI *Chronicon Eccleſ. Pomeraniæ*, lib. i. as alſo a learned *Diſſertation* concerning the converſion of the Pomeranians by the miniſtry of OTHO, written in the German language by CHRISTOPHER SCHOTGEN, and publiſhed at *Stargard* in the year 1724. Add to theſe, MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom vi. p. 123. 146. 323.

[*b*] SAXO GRAMMATICUS, *Hiſtor. Danic.* lib. xiv. p. 239.—HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Slavorum.* lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 234. & HENR. BANGERTUS, *ad h. l.*—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccleſiæ Danicæ*, tom. i. p. 404.

[Beſides the hiſtorians here mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM, we refer the curious reader to an excellent hiſtory of *Denmark*, written in French by M. MALLET, profeſſor at *Copenhagen*. In the firſt volume of this hiſtory, the ingenious and learned author has given a very intereſting account of the progreſs of Chriſtianity in the northern parts of *Europe*, and a particular relation of the exploits of ABSALOM, who was, at the ſame time, archbiſhop, general, admiral, and prime miniſter, and who led the victorious Danes to battle by ſea and land without neglecting the cure of ſouls, or diminiſhing, in the leaſt, his pious labours in the propagation of the goſpel abroad, and its maintenance and ſupport at home.]

[*c*] Moſt writers with BARONIUS place this event in the year 1151. Different, however, from

accounts of its effects. The Finlanders were commanded to embrace the religion of the conqueror, which the greateſt part of them did, though with the utmoſt reluctance [d]. The founder and ruler of this new church was HENRY, archbiſhop of *Upſal*, who accompanied the victorious monarch in that bloody campaign. This prelate, whoſe zeal was not ſufficiently tempered with the mild and gentle ſpirit of the religion he taught, treated the new converts with great ſeverity, and was aſſaſſinated at laſt in a cruel manner on account of the heavy pennance he impoſed upon a perſon of great authority, who had been guilty of man ſlaughter. This melancholy event procured HENRY the honours of ſaintſhip and martyrdom, which were ſolemnly conferred upon him by pope ADRIAN IV [e].

The Livonians.

IV. The propagation of the goſpel among the Livonians was attended with much difficulty, and alſo with horrible ſcenes of cruelty and bloodſhed. The firſt miſſionary, who attempted the converſion of that ſavage people, was MAINARD, a regular canon of *St. Auguſtin*, in the monaſtery of *Sigeberg*, who, towards the concluſion of this century [f], travelled to *Livonia*, with a company of merchants of *Bremen* who traded thither, and improved this opportunity of ſpreading the light of the goſpel in that barbarous region of ſuperſtition and darkneſs. The inſtructions and exhortations of this zealous apoſtle were little attended to, and produced little or no effect upon that uncivilized nation; whereupon he addreſſed himſelf to the Roman pontif, URBAN III, who conſecrated him biſhop of the Livonians, and, at the ſame time, declared a *holy* war againſt that obſtinate people. This war, which was at firſt carried on againſt the inhabitants of the province of *Eſthonia*, was continued with ſtill greater vigour and rendered more univerſal by BERTHOLD, abbot of *Lucca*, who left his monaſtery to ſhare the labours and laurels of MAINARD, whom he, accordingly, ſucceeded in the ſee of *Livonia*. The new biſhop marched into that province at the head of a powerful army which he had raiſed in *Saxony*, preached the goſpel ſword in hand, and proved its truth by blows, inſtead of arguments. ALBERT, canon of *Bremen*, became the third biſhop of *Livonia*, and followed, with a barbarous enthuſiaſm, the ſame military methods of converſion that had been practiſed by his predeceſſor. He entered *Livonia*, A. D. 1198, with a freſh body of troops, drawn out of *Saxony*, and encamping at *Riga*, inſtituted there, by the direction of the Roman pontif INNOCENT III, the *military order of the knights ſword-bearers* [g] who were commiſſioned to dragoon the Livonians into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and to oblige them, by force of arms, to receive the

benefits

---

this is the chronology of VASTOVIUS and OERNHIELMIUS, the former placing it A. D. 1150, and the latter A. D. 1157.

[d] OERNHIELMII *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. gentis Suecorum*, lib. iv. cap. iv. § 13.—JO. LOCCENII *Hiſtor. Suecica*, lib. iii. p. 76. ed. *Francof.*—ERLANDI *Vita Erici Sancti*, cap. vii.—VASTOVII *Vitis Aquilonia*, p. 65.

[e] VASTOVII *Vitis Aquilon. ſeu Vitæ Sanctorum regni Suegothici*, p. 62.—ERIC. BENZELII *Monumenta Eccleſiæ Sueogothicæ*, part. i. p. 33.

[f] In the year 1186.

[g] *Equeſtris Ordo Militum Enſiferorum.*

benefits of baptiſm [*h*]. New legions were ſent from *Germany* to ſecond the efforts, and add efficacy to the miſſion of theſe booted apoſtles; and they, together with the knights ſword bearers ſo cruelly oppreſſed, ſlaughtered and tormented this wretched people, that, exhauſted, at length, and unable to ſtand any longer firm againſt the arm of perſecution ſtrengthened ſtill by new acceſſions of power, they abandoned the ſtatues of their Pagan deities, and ſubſtituted in their place the images of the ſaints. But while they received the bleſſings of the goſpel, they were, at the ſame time, deprived of all earthly comforts; for their lands and poſſeſſions were taken from them with the moſt odious circumſtances of cruelty and violence, and the knights and biſhops divided the ſpoil [*i*].

The Sclavonians.

V. None of the northern nations had a more rooted averſion to the Chriſtians, and a more obſtinate antipathy to their religion, than the Sclavonians, a rough and barbarous people, who inhabited the coaſt of the Baltic ſea. This excited the zeal of ſeveral neighbouring princes, and of a multitude of pious miſſionaries, who united their efforts in order to conquer the prejudices of this people, and to open their eyes upon the light of the goſpel. Henry, duke of *Saxony*, ſurnamed the *Lion*, diſtinguiſhed himſelf, in a particular manner, by the ardour which he diſcovered in the execution of this pious deſign, as well as by the wiſe methods he employed to render it ſucceſsful. Among other meaſures that were proper for this purpoſe, he reſtored from their ruins, and endowed richly three biſhoprics [*k*] that had been ravaged and deſtroyed by theſe Barbarians; *to wit*, the biſhoprics of *Ratzebourg* and *Schwerin*, and that of *Oldenbourg*, which was afterwards tranſplanted to *Lubec*. The moſt eminent of the Chriſtian doctors, who attempted the converſion of the Sclavonians, was Vicelinus, a native of *Hamelen*, a man of extraordinary merit, who ſurpaſſed almoſt all his cotemporaries in genuine piety and ſolid learning, and who, after having preſided many years in the ſociety of the regular canons of *St. Auguſtin* at *Falderen*, was, at length, conſecrated biſhop of *Oldenbourg*. This excellent man had employed the laſt thirty years of his life [*l*], amidſt numberleſs vexations, dangers, and difficulties, in inſtructing the Sclavonians, and exhorting them to comply with the invitations of the goſpel of CHRIST; and as his pious labours were directed by true wiſdom, and carried on with the moſt indefatigable induſtry and zeal, ſo were they attended with much fruit, even among that fierce and untractable people. Nor was his miniſtry among the Sclavonians the only circumſtance that redounds to the honour of his memory; the hiſtory of his life and actions in general, furniſh proofs of his piety and zeal, ſufficient to tranſmit his name to the lateſt generations [m].

[*h*] See Henr. Leonh. Schurzfleischii *Hiſtoria Ordinis Enſiferorum Equitum. Witteberg* 1701, 8vo.

[*i*] See the *Origines Livoniæ, ſeu Chronicon vetus Livonicum*, publiſhed in folio, at *Francfort*, in the year 1740, by Jo. Daniel Gruberus, and enriched with ample and learned obſervations, and notes, in which the laborious author enumerates all the writers of the Livonian hiſtory, and corrects their miſtakes.

[(*k*) Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter is very different from that which is given by Fleury, who aſſerts, that it was Hartwick, archbiſhop of *Bremen*, who reſtored the three ruined ſees, and conſecrated Vicelinus, biſhop of *Oldenbourg*; and that having done this without addreſſing himſelf to Henry, that prince ſeized the tithes of Vicelinus, until a reconciliation was afterwards brought about between the offended prince and the worthy biſhop. See Fleury *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. lxix. p. 665. 668. edit. *Brux.* Fleury, in this and other parts of his hiſtory, ſhews, that he is but indifferently verſed in the hiſtory of *Germany*, and has not drawn from the beſt ſources. The authorities which Dr. Mosheim produces for his account of the matter, are, the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. iii. p. 16. 19. 34. 55. 61. 63. 72. 82. with the celebrated *Preface* of Scheidius, § xiv. p. 41.—Ludewig's *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptorum*, tom. vi. p. 230.—Jo. Ern. de Westphalen, *Monumenta inedita rerum Cimbricarum et Megapolenſ.* tom. ii. p. 1998.]

[*l*] That is from the year 1124 to the year 1154, in which he died.

The judgment we ought to form of theſe converſions.

VI. It is needleſs to repeat here the obſervation we have had ſo often occaſion to make upon ſuch converſions as theſe we have been now relating, or to advertiſe the reader that the ſavage nations, who were thus dragooned into the church, became the diſciples of CHRIST, not ſo much in reality, as in outward appearance. [They profeſſed, with an inward reluctance, a religion which was inculcated by violence and bloodſhed, which recalled to their remembrance nothing but ſcenes of deſolation and miſery, and which, indeed, when conſidered in the repreſentations that were given of it by the greateſt part of the miſſionaries, was but a few degrees removed from the abſurdities of paganiſm.] The pure and rational religion of the goſpel was never preſented to theſe unhappy nations in its native ſimplicity; they were only taught to appeaſe the Deity, and to render him propitious by a ſenſeleſs round of trifling ceremonies and bodily exerciſes, which, in many circumſtances, reſembled the ſuperſtitions they were obliged to renounce, and might have been eaſily reconciled with them, had it not been that the name and hiſtory of CHRIST, the ſign of the croſs, and ſome diverſity between certain rites and ceremonies of the two religions oppoſed this coalition. Beſides, the miſſionaries, whoſe zeal for impoſing the name of Chriſtians upon this people was ſo vehement and even furious, were extremely indulgent in all other reſpects, and oppoſed their prejudices and vices with much gentleneſs and forbearance. They permitted them to retain ſeveral rites and obſervances that were in direct oppoſition to the ſpirit of Chriſtianity, and to the nature of true piety. The truth of the matter ſeems to have been this, that the leading views of theſe Chriſtian heralds, and propagators of the faith, a ſmall number excepted, were rather turned towards the advancement of their own intereſts, and the confirming and extending the dominion of the Roman pontifs, than towards the true converſion of theſe ſavage Pagans, that converſion which conſiſts in the removal of ignorance, the correction of error, and the reformation of vice.

The ſtate of affairs in Tartary changes in favour of the Chriſtians.

VII. A great revolution in *Aſiatic Tartary*, which borders upon *Cathay*, changed the face of things in that diſtant region about the commencement of this century, and proved, by its effects, extremely beneficial to the Chriſtian cauſe. Towards the concluſion of the preceding century, died COIREMCHAN, otherwiſe called KENCHAM, the moſt powerful monarch that was known in the eaſtern regions of *Aſia*; and while that mighty kingdom was deprived of its chief, it was invaded, with ſuch uncommon valour and ſucceſs, by a Neſtorian prieſt, whoſe name was JOHN, that it fell before his victorious arms, and acknowledged this warlike and enterprizing *preſbyter*, as its monarch. This was the famous PRESTER JOHN, whoſe territory was, for a long time, conſidered by the Europeans as a ſecond paradiſe, as the ſeat of opulence and complete felicity. As he was a *preſbyter* before his elevation to the royal dignity, many continued to call him *preſbyter John*, even when he was ſeated on the throne [*n*]; but his kingly name was UNGCHAN. The high notions, the Greeks and Latins generally entertained of the grandeur and magnificence of this royal preſbyter, were principally owing to the letters he wrote to the Roman emperors FREDERIC I, and to EMANUEL emperor of the Greeks, in which, puffed up with proſperity and fluſhed with ſucceſs, he vaunts his victories over the neighbouring nations that diſputed his paſſage to the throne, deſcribes, in the moſt pompous and extravagant terms, the ſplendor of his riches, the grandeur of his ſtate, and the extent of his dominions, and exalts himſelf far above all other earthly monarchs. All this was eaſily believed, and the Neſtorians were extremely zealous in confirming the boaſts of their vain glorious prince. He was ſucceeded by his ſon, or as others think, his brother, whoſe name was DAVID, though, in common diſcourſe, he was alſo called PRESTER JOHN, as his predeceſſor had been. The reign of DAVID was far from being happy, nor did he end his days in peace; GENGHIZ KAN, the great and warlike emperor of the Tartars, invaded his territories towards the concluſion of this century, and deprived him both of his life and his dominions.

---

[m] There is a particular and ample account of VICELINUS, in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MOLLERUS, tom. ii. p. 910. and in the *Res Hamburg.* of LAMBECIUS, lib. ii. p. 12. See alſo upon this ſubject the *Origines Neomonaſter. et Bordeſholmenſ.* of the moſt learned and induſtrious JOH. ERN. DE WESTPHALEN, which are publiſhed in the 2d *tome* of the *Monumenta inedita Cimbrica*, p. 2344. and the *Preface* to this *tome*, p. 33. There is in this work a print of VICELINUS well engraven.

[*n*] The account I have here given of this famous *preſbyter*, commonly called PRESTER JOHN, who was, for a long time, conſidered as the greateſt and happieſt of all earthly monarchs, is what appeared to me the moſt probable among the various relations that have been given of the life and adventures of that extraordinary man. This account is moreover confirmed by the teſtimonies of cotemporary writers, whoſe knowledge and impartiality render them worthy of credit: ſuch as WILLIAM of *Tripoli* (ſee DU FRESNE'S *Adnot. ad vitam Ludovici Sti à Joinvillio ſcriptam*, p. 89.) as alſo a certain biſhop of *Gabala*, mentioned by OTTO *Friſing. Chronic.* lib. vii. cap. xxxiii. See alſo GUILLAUME RUBRUQUIS *Voyage*, cap. xviii. p. 36. in the *Antiqua in Aſiam Itinera*, collected by fath. BERGERON. and ALBERIC. *in Chronico ad A.* 1165 & 1170, in LEIBNITII *Acceſſionibus Hiſtoricis*, tom. ii. p. 345. 355. It is indeed ſurprizing, that ſuch authentic records as theſe ſhould have eſcaped the obſervation of the learned, and that ſo many different opinions ſhould have been advanced concerning PRESTER JOHN, and the place of his reſidence. But it is too generally the fate of learned men, to overlook thoſe accounts that carry the plaineſt marks of evidence, and from a paſſion for the *marvellous* to plunge into the regions of uncertainty and doubt. In the xvth century, JOHN II, king of *Portugal*, employed PEDRO COUVILLIANO in a laborious inquiry into the real ſituation of the kingdom of PRESTER JOHN. The curious voyager undertook this taſk, and, for information in the matter, travelled with a few companions into *Abyſſinia*; and obſerving in the emperor of the Abyſſinians, or Ethiopians, many circumſtances that reſembled the accounts which, at that time, prevailed in *Europe* concerning PRESTER JOHN, he perſuaded himſelf that he had fulfilled his commiſſion, and found out the reſidence of that extraordinary monarch, who was the object of his reſearches. His opinion gained eaſily credit in *Europe*, which had not as yet emerged out of its ignorance and barbariſm. See MORINUS, *De ſacris Eccleſ. Ordinationibus*, part. II. p. 367. But a new light was caſt upon this matter in the xvii h century, by the publication of ſeveral pieces which the induſtry of the curious drew forth from their obſcurity, and by which a great number of learned men were engaged to abandon the Portugueſe opinion, and were convinced that PRESTER JOHN reigned in *Aſia*, though they ſtill continued to diſpnte about the ſituation of his kingdom, and other particular circumſtances. There are, notwithſtanding all this, ſome men of the moſt eminent learning in our times, who maintain, that JOHN was emperor of the Abyſſinians, and thus prefer the Portugueſe opinion, though deſtitute of authentic proofs and teſtimonies, to the other abovementioned, though ſupported by the ſtrongeſt evidence, and the moſt unqueſtionable authorities. See EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Hiſt. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 223. 337.—JOS. FRANC. LAFITAU, *Hiſt. des Decouvertes des Portugaiſ.* tom. i. p. 58. & tom. iii. p. 57.—HENR. LE GRAND, *Diſſ. de Johanne Preſbytero* in LOBO'S *Voyage d'Abiſſinie*, tom. i. p. 295.

The affairs of the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine* in a declining ſtate.

VIII. The new kingdom of *Jeruſalem*, which had been erected by the *holy warriors* of *France* towards the concluſion of the preceding century, ſeemed to flouriſh conſiderably at the beginning of this, and to reſt upon firm and ſolid foundations. This proſperous ſcene was, however, but tranſitory, and was ſoon ſucceeded by the moſt terrible calamities and deſolations. For when the Mahometans ſaw vaſt numbers of thoſe that had engaged in this holy war returning into *Europe*, and the Chriſtian chiefs that remained in *Paleſtine* divided into factions, and advancing, every one his private intereſt without any regard to the public good, they reſumed their courage, recovered from the terror and conſternation into which they had been thrown by the amazing valour and rapid ſucceſs of the European legions, and gathering troops and ſolliciting ſuccours from all quarters, they harraſſed and exhauſted the Chriſtians by invaſions and wars without interruption. The Chriſtians, on the other hand, ſuſtained their efforts with their uſual fortitude, and maintained their ground during many years; but when *Atabec Zenghi* [o], after a long ſiege, made himſelf maſter of the city of *Edeſſa*, and threatened *Antioch* with the ſame fate, their courage began to fail, and a diffidence in their own ſtrength obliged them to turn their eyes once more towards *Europe*. They accordingly implored, in the moſt lamentable ſtrain, the aſſiſtance of the European princes, and requeſted that a new army of croſs-bearing champions might be ſent to ſupport their tottering empire in the Holy land. Their entreaties were favourably received by the Roman pontifs, who left no method of perſuaſion unemployed, that might engage the emperor and other Chriſtian princes to execute a new expedition into *Paleſtine*.

The cruſade renewed.

IX. This new expedition was not, however, reſolved upon with ſuch unanimity and precipitation as the former had been; it was the ſubject of long deliberation, and its expediency was keenly debated both in the cabinets of princes, and in the aſſemblies of the clergy and the people. BERNARD, the famous abbot of *Clairval*, a man of the boldeſt reſolution and of the greateſt authority, put an end to theſe diſputes under the pontificate of EUGENIUS III, who had been his diſciple and who was wholly governed by his counſels. This eloquent and zealous eccleſiaſtic *preached the croſs*, i. e. the *cruſade*, in *France* and *Germany*, with great ardour and ſucceſs; and in the grand parliament aſſembled at *Vezelai*, A. D. 1146, at which LEWIS VII, king of *France*, with his queen, and a prodigious concourſe of the principal nobility, were preſent, BERNARD recommended this holy expedition with ſuch a perſuaſive power, and declared with ſuch aſſurance, that he had a divine commiſſion to foretel its glorious ſucceſs, that the king, the queen, and all the nobles immediately put on the military croſs, and prepared themſelves for the voyage into *Paleſtine*. CONRAD III, emperor of *Germany*, was, for ſome time, unmoved by the exhortations of BERNARD, but he was ſoon gained over by the urgent ſollicitations of the fervent abbot, and followed, accordingly, the example of the French monarch. The two princes, each at the head of a numerous army, ſet out for *Paleſtine*, to which they were to march by different roads. But, before their arrival in the holy land, the greateſt part of their forces were melted away, and periſhed miſerably, ſome by famine, ſome by the ſword of the Mahometans, ſome by ſhipwreck, and a conſiderable number by the perfidious cruelty of the Greeks, who looked upon the weſtern nations as more to be feared than the Mahometans themſelves. LEWIS VII, left his kingdom A. D. 1147, and, in the month of March of the following year, he arrived at *Antioch*, with the wretched remains of his army, exhauſted and dejected by the hardſhips they had endured. CONRAD ſet out alſo in the year 1147, in the month of May, and, in November following, he arrived at *Nice*, where he joined the French army, after having loſt the greateſt part of his own by calamities of various kinds. From *Nice* the two princes proceeded to *Jeruſalem* A. D. 1148, from whence they led back into *Europe*, the year following, the miſerable handful of troops, which had ſurvived the diſaſters they met with in this expedition. Such was the unhappy iſſue of this ſecond *cruſade*, which was rendered ineffectual by a variety of cauſes, but more particularly, by the jealouſies and diviſions that reigned among the Chriſtian chiefs in *Paleſtine*. Nor was it more ineffectual in *Paleſtine* than it was detrimental to *Europe*, by draining the wealth of its faireſt provinces, and deſtroying ſuch a prodigious number of its inhabitants [*p*].

---

[o] *Atabeck* was a title of honour given by the *Sultans* to the viceroys or lieutenants, whom they intruſted with the government of their provinces. The Latin authors, who have wrote the hiſtory of this holy war, and of whom BONGARSIUS has given us a complete liſt, call this *Atabeck Zenghi*, SANGUINUS. See HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* at the word ATABECK, p. 142.

The kingdom of *Jeruſalem* overturned.

X. The unhappy iſſue of this ſecond expedition was not however ſufficient, when conſidered alone, to render the affairs of the Chriſtians, in *Paleſtine*, entirely deſperate. Had their chiefs and princes laid aſide their animoſities and contentions, and attacked the common enemy with their united force, they would have ſoon repaired their loſſes, and recovered their glory. But this was far from being the caſe. A fatal corruption of ſentiments and manners reigned among all ranks and orders. Both the people and their leaders, and more eſpecially the latter, abandoned themſelves without reluctance to all the exceſſes of ambition, avarice, and injuſtice; they indulged themſelves in the practice of all ſorts of vices, and by their inteſtine quarrels, jealouſies, and diſcords, they weakened their efforts againſt the enemies that ſurrounded them on all ſides, and conſumed their ſtrength by thus unhappily dividing it. SALADIN, viceroy, or rather ſultan, of *Egypt* and *Syria* [q], and the moſt valiant chief of whom the Mahometan annals boaſt, took advantage of theſe lamentable diviſions. He waged war againſt the Chriſtians with the utmoſt valour and ſucceſs; took priſoner GUY of LUSIGNAN, king of *Jeruſalem*, in a fatal battle fought near *Tiberias*, A. D. 1187; and, in the courſe of the ſame year, reduced *Jeruſalem* itſelf under his dominion [r]. The carnage and deſolations that accompanied this dreadful campaign threw the affairs of the Chriſtians in the eaſt into the moſt deſperate condition, and left them no glimpſe of hope, but what aroſe from the expected ſuccours of the European princes. Theſe ſuccours were obtained for them by the Roman pontifs with much difficulty, and in conſequence of repeated ſollicitations and entreaties. But the event, as we ſhall now ſee, was by no means anſwerable to the deep ſchemes that were concerted, and the pains that were employed for the ſupport of the tottering kingdom of *Jeruſalem*.

[*p*] Beſides the hiſtorians enumerated by BONGARSIUS, ſee MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict*, tom. vi. p. 399. 404. 407. 417. 451. JAC. GERVASII *Hiſtoire de l'Abbé Suger*, tom. iii. p. 104. 128. 173. 190. 239. This was the famous SUGER, abbot of *St. Denis*, who had ſeconded the exhortations of BERNARD in favour of the *cruſade*, and whom LEWIS appointed regent of *France* during his abſence. VERTOT, *Hiſtoire des Chevaliers de Malte*, tom. i. p. 86. JOH. JAC. MASCOVIUS, *De rebus imperii ſub Conrado* III.

A third cruſade undertaken.

XI. The third expedition was undertaken, A. D. 1189, by FREDERIC I, ſurnamed BARBAROSSA, emperor of *Germany*, who, with a prodigious army, marched through ſeveral Grecian provinces, where he had innumerable difficulties and obſtacles to overcome, into the *Leſſer Aſia*, from whence, after having defeated the ſultan of *Iconium*, he penetrated into *Syria*. His valour and conduct promiſed ſucceſsful and glorious campaigns to the army he commanded, when, by an unhappy accident, he loſt his life in the river *Saleph* [s], which runs through *Seleucia*. The manner of his death is not known with any degree of certainty; the loſs however of ſuch an able chief dejected the ſpirits of his troops, ſo that conſiderable numbers of them returned into *Europe*. Thoſe that remained, continued the war under the command of FREDERIC, ſon of the deceaſed emperor; but the greateſt part of them periſhed miſerably by a peſtilential diſorder which raged with prodigious violence in the camp, and ſwept off vaſt numbers every day. The new general died of this terrible diſeaſe A. D. 1191; thoſe that eſcaped its fury were diſperſed, and few returned to their own country [t].

[(q) SALADIN, ſo called by the weſtern writers, and SALAH'ADDIN by the Orientals, was no longer vizir or viceroy of *Egypt*, when he undertook the ſiege of *Jeruſalem*, but had uſurped the ſovereign power in that country, and had alſo added to his dominions, by right of conqueſt, ſeveral provinces of *Syria*.]

[r] See the *Life of Saladin* by BOHAO'DDIN EBN SHEDDAD, an Arabian writer, whoſe hiſtory of that warlike ſultan was publiſhed at *Leyden*, in the year 1732, by the late celebrated profeſſor ALBERT SCULTENS, and accompanied with an excellent Latin tranſlation. See alſo HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient*. at the article SALAH'ADDIN, p. 742. and MARIGNY's *Hiſtoire des Arabes*, tom. iv. p. 289. [But above all, see the learned *Hiſtory of the Arabians* in the *Modern Part of the Univerſal Hiſtory*.]

[(s) MAIMBOURG, in his *Hiſtoire des Croiſades*, and MARIGNI, in his *Hiſt. du* XII^{e} *Siecle*, ſay, that FREDERIC periſhed in the *Cydnus*, a river in *Cilicia*. But they are eaſily to be reconciled with our author, as, according to the deſcriptions given of the river *Saleph* by ſeveral learned geographers, and among others by ROGER the Annaliſt, it appears that the *Saleph* and the *Cydnus* were the ſame river under different names.]

[t] See an ample and ſatisfactory account of this unhappy campaign in the *Life of Frederic* I, written in German by HENRY Count BUNAU, p. 278. 293. 309.

XII. The

Its iſſue.

XII. The example of FREDERIC BARBAROSSA was followed, in the year 1190, by PHILIP AUGUSTUS king of *France*, and *lion hearted* RICHARD, king of *England*. Theſe two monarchs ſet out from their reſpective dominions with a conſiderable number of ſhips of war and tranſports [u], arrived in *Paleſtine* in the year 1191, each at the head of a ſeparate army, and were pretty ſucceſsful in their firſt encounters with the infidels. After the reduction of the ſtrong city of *Acca* or *Ptolemais*, which had been defended by the Moſlems with the moſt obſtinate valour, the French monarch returned into *Europe*, in the month of July, 1191, leaving, however, behind him a conſiderable part of the army which he had conducted into *Paleſtine*. After his departure, the king of *England* puſhed the war with the greateſt vigour, gave daily marks of his heroic intrepidity and military ſkill, and not only defeated SALADIN in ſeveral engagements, but alſo made himſelf maſter of *Jaffa* [w] and *Cæſarea*. Deſerted however, by the French and Italians, and influenced by other motives and conſiderations of the greateſt weight, he concluded, A. D. 1192, with SALADIN a truce of three years, three months, and as many days, and ſoon after evacuated *Paleſtine* with his whole army [x]. Such was the iſſue of the third expedition againſt the infidels, which exhauſted *England*, *France*, and *Germany* both of men and money, without bringing any ſolid advantage, or giving even a favourable turn to the affairs of the Chriſtians in the Holy land.

Inſtitution of the military order of knighthood.

XIII. Theſe bloody wars between the Chriſtians and Mahometans gave riſe to *three famous military orders*, whoſe office it was to deſtroy the robbers that infeſted the public roads, to haraſs the Moſlems by perpetual inroads and warlike atchievements, to aſſiſt the poor and ſick pilgrims, whom the devotion of the times conducted to the holy ſepulchre, and to perform ſeveral other ſervices that tended to the general good [y]. The firſt of theſe orders was that of the *knights of St. John of Jeruſalem*, who derived their name, and particularly that of *Hoſpitallers* from an hoſpital dedicated, in that city, to St. JOHN the *baptiſt*, in which certain pious and charitable brethren were conſtantly employed in relieving and refreſhing with neceſſary ſupplies the indigent and diſeaſed pilgrims, who were daily arriving at *Jeruſalem*. When this city became the metropolis of a new kingdom, the revenues of the hoſpital, were ſo prodigiouſly encreaſed by the liberality of ſeveral princes and the pious donations of ſuch opulent perſons as frequented the *holy places*, that they far ſurpaſſed the wants of thoſe whom they were deſigned to cheriſh and relieve. Hence it was that RAYMOND DU PUY, who was the ruler of this charitable houſe, offered to the king of *Jeruſalem* to make war upon the Mahometans at his own expence, ſeconded by his brethren, who ſerved under him in this famous hoſpital. BALDUIN II, to whom this propoſal was made, accepted it readily, and the enterprize was ſolemnly approved of and confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontif. Thus all of a ſudden, the world was ſurprized with the ſtrange transformation of a devout fraternity, who had lived remote from the noiſe and tumult of arms in the performance of works of charity and mercy, into a valiant and hardy band of warriors. The whole Order was upon this occaſion divided into three claſſes; the firſt contained the *knights*, or ſoldiers of illuſtrious birth, who were to unſheath their ſwords in the Chriſtian cauſe; in the ſecond were comprehended the *prieſts*, who were to officiate in the churches that belonged to the order; and in the third, the *ſerving brethren*, or the ſoldiers of low condition. This celebrated order gave, upon many occaſions, eminent proofs of their reſolution and valour, and acquired immenſe opulence by their heroic atchievements. When *Paleſtine* was irrecoverably loſt, the *knights* paſſed into the iſle of *Cyprus*; they afterwards made themſelves maſters of the iſle of *Rhodes*, where they maintained themſelves for a long time; but being, at length, driven thence by the Turks, they received from the emperor CHARLES V a grant of the iſland of *Malta*, where their chief, or grand commander, ſtill reſides [z].

---

[u] The learned authors of the *Modern Univerſal Hiſtory* tell us, that PHILIP arrived in *Paleſtine* with a ſupply of men, money, &c. on board *ſix ſhips*, whereas RENAUDOT mentions 100 ſail as employed in this expedition. The fleet of RICHARD conſiſted of 150 large ſhips, beſides galleys, &c.]

[w] More commonly known by the name of *Joppa*.

[x] DANIEL, *Hiſtoire de France*, tom. iii. p. 426.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. See there the reign of RICHARD, *Cœur de Lion*.—MARIGNY, *Hiſtoire des Arabes*, tom. iv. p. 285.

[y] The writers, who have given the hiſtory of theſe three orders, are enumerated by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* p. 465. but his enumeration is not complete.

The knights templars.

XIV. Another order, which was entirely of a military nature, was that of the *knights templars*, ſo called from a palace, adjoining to the temple of *Jeruſalem*, which was appropriated to their uſe for a certain time by BALDUIN II. The foundations of this order were laid at *Jeruſalem*, in the year 1118, by HUGUES DES PAYENS, GEOFFRY of St. ALDEMAR, or St. OMER, as ſome will have it, and ſeven other perſons whoſe names are unknown; but it was not before the year 1128, that it acquired a proper degree of ſtability, by being confirmed ſolemnly in the council of *Troyes*, and ſubjected to a rule of diſcipline drawn up by St. BERNARD [a]. Theſe warlike templars were to defend and ſupport the cauſe of Chriſtianity by force of arms, to have inſpection over the public roads, and to protect the pilgrims, who came to viſit *Jeruſalem* againſt the inſults and barbarity of the Mahometans. The order flouriſhed for ſome time, and acquired, by the valour of its knights, immenſe riches and an eminent degree of military renown; but as their proſperity increaſed, their vices were multiplied, and their arrogance, luxury, and inhuman cruelty roſe at laſt to ſuch a monſtrous height, that their privileges were revoked and their order ſuppreſſed with the moſt terrible circumſtances of infamy and ſeverity by a decree of the pope and of the council of *Vienne* in *Dauphiny*, as we ſhall ſee in the hiſtory of the XIVth century [b].

---

[z] The beſt and the moſt recent hiſtory of this order is that which was compoſed by VERTOT at the requeſt of the knights of *Malta*; it was firſt publiſhed at *Paris*, and afterwards at *Amſterdam*, in five volumes, 8vo. in the year 1732. See alſo HELYOT's *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. iii. p. 72.

[a] See MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 159.

[b] See MATTHEW PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 56. for an account of the commencement of this order. See alſo PUTEAN, *Hiſtoire de l'Ordre Militaire des Templiers*, which was republiſhed, with conſiderable additions, at *Bruſſels* in 4to, in the year 1751.—NIC. GURTLERI *Hiſtoria Templariorum Militum, Amſtelodam.* 1691, in 8vo.

The Teutonic order.

XV. The third order reſembled the firſt in this reſpect, that, though it was a military inſtitution, the care of the poor, and the relief of the ſick were not excluded from the ſervices it preſcribed. Its members were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Teutonic knights of St. Mary of Jeruſalem*, and as to its firſt riſe, we cannot, with any degree of certainty, trace it farther back than the year 1190, during the ſiege of *Accâ*, or *Ptolemais*, though there are Hiſtorians adventurous enough to ſeek its origin (which they place at *Jeruſalem*) in a more remote period. During the long and tedious ſiege of *Accâ*, ſeveral pious and charitable merchants of *Bremen* and *Lubec*, touched with compaſſion at a ſight of the miſeries that the beſiegers ſuffered in the midſt of their ſucceſs, devoted themſelves entirely to the ſervice of the ſick and wounded ſoldiers, and erected a kind of hoſpital or tent, where they gave conſtant attendance to all ſuch unhappy objects as had recourſe to their charity. This pious undertaking was ſo agreeable to the German princes, who were preſent at this terrible ſiege, that they thought proper to form a fraternity of German knights to bring it to a greater degree of perfection. Their reſolution was highly approved of by the Roman pontif CELESTINE III, who confirmed the new order by a bull iſſued out the twenty third of February, A. D. 1192. This order was entirely appropriated to the Germans, and even of them none were admitted as members of it, but ſuch as were of an illuſtrious birth. The ſupport of Chriſtianity, the defence of the Holy land, and the relief of the poor and needy, were the important duties and ſervice to which the Teutonic knights devoted themſelves by a ſolemn vow. Auſterity and frugality were the firſt characteriſtics of this riſing order, and the equeſtrian garment [c], with bread and water, were the only rewards which the knights derived from their generous labours. But as, according to the fate of human things, proſperity engenders corruption, ſo it happened that this auſterity was of a ſhort duration, and diminiſhed in proportion as the revenues and poſſeſſions of the order augmented. The Teutonic knights, after their retreat from *Paleſtine*, made themſelves maſters of *Pruſſia*, *Livonia*, *Courland*, and *Semigallen*; but, in proceſs of time, their victorious arms received ſeveral checks, and when the light of the reformation aroſe upon *Germany*, they were deprived of the richeſt provinces which they poſſeſſed in that country, though they ſtill retain there a certain portion of their ancient territories [d].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The ſtate of the church in the weſtern and northern provinces.

I. THE progreſs of Chriſtianity in the weſt had diſarmed its moſt inveterate enemies, and deprived them of the power of doing much miſchief, though they ſtill entertained the ſame averſion to the diſciples of JESUS.

---

[c] This garment was a white mantle with a black croſs.

[d] See RAYMUNDI DUELLII *Hiſtor. Ordin. Teutonici*, publiſhed in folio at *Vienna* in 1727.—

The Jews and Pagans were no longer able to oppoſe the propagation of the goſpel, or to oppreſs its miniſters. Their malignity remained, but their credit and authority were gone. The Jews were accuſed by the Chriſtians of various crimes, whether real or fictitious we ſhall not determine; but inſtead of attacking their accuſers, they were ſatisfied to defend their own lives, and to ſecure their perſons, without daring to give vent to their reſentment. The ſtate of things was ſomewhat different in the Northern provinces. The Pagans were yet numerous there in ſeveral diſtricts, and, wherever they were the majority, they perſecuted the Chriſtians with the utmoſt barbarity, the moſt unrelenting, and mercileſs fury [*e*]. It is true, the Chriſtian kings and princes, who lived in the neighbourhood of theſe perſecuting Barbarians, checked by degrees their impetuous rage, and never ceaſed to haraſs and weaken them by perpetual wars and incurſions, until, at length, they ſubdued them entirely, and deprived them, by force, both of their independency and their ſuperſtitions.

Its ſufferings in the eaſt.

II. The writers of this century complain grievouſly of the inhuman rage with which the Saracens perſecuted the Chriſtians in the eaſt, nor can we queſtion the truth of what they relate concerning this terrible perſecution. But they paſs over in ſilence the principal reaſons that inflamed the reſentment of this fierce people, and voluntarily forget that the Chriſtians were the firſt aggreſſors in this dreadful war. If we conſider the matter with impartiality and candour, the conduct of the Saracens, however barbarous it may have been, will not appear ſo ſurprizing, particularly when we reflect on the provocations they received. In the firſt place, they had a right, by the laws of war, to repel, by force, the violent invaſion of their country, and the Chriſtians could not expect without being chargeable with the moſt frontleſs impudence, that a people whom they attacked with a formidable army, and whom, in the fury of their miſguided zeal, they maſſacred without mercy, ſhould receive their inſults with a tame ſubmiſſion, and give up their lives and poſſeſſions without reſiſtance. It muſt alſo be confeſſed, though with ſorrow, that the Chriſtians did not content themſelves with making war upon the Mahometans in order to deliver *Jeruſalem* and the holy ſepulchre out of their hands, but carried their brutal fury to the greateſt length, diſgraced their cauſe by the moſt deteſtable crimes, filled the eaſtern provinces, through which they paſſed, with ſcenes of horror, and made the Saracens feel the terrible effects of their violence and barbarity wherever their arms were ſucceſsful. Is it then ſo ſurprizing to ſee the infidel Saracens committing, by way of repriſal, the ſame barbarities that the holy warriors had perpetrated without the leaſt provocation? Is there any thing ſo new and ſo extraordinary in this, that a people naturally fierce, and exaſperated,

---

PETRI DUSBURG, *Chronicon Pruſſiæ*, publiſhed in 4to at *Jena*, in the year 1679, by CHRISTOPH. HARTKNOCHIUS.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. iii. p. 140.—*Chronicon Ordinis Teutonici* in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analectis veteris ævi*, tom. v. p. 621. 658. ed. nov.—*Privilegia Ordinis Teutonici* in PETR. à LUDEWIG *Reliquiis Manuſcriptor.* tom. vi. p. 43.

[*e*] HELMOLD, *Chronic. Slavor.* lib. i. cap. xxxiv. p. 88. cap. xxxv. p. 89. cap. xl. p. 99.—LINDENBROGII *Scriptor. Septentrional.* p. 195, 196. 201.—PETRI LAMBECII *Res Hamburg.* lib. i. p. 23.

moreover, by the calamities of a religious war carried on againſt them in contradiction to all the dictates of juſtice and humanity, ſhould avenge themſelves upon the Chriſtians who reſided in *Paleſtine*, as profeſſing the religion which gave occaſion to the war, and attached, of conſequence, to the cauſe of their enemies and invaders?

Preſter John departs this life.

III. The rapid and amazing victories of the great GENGHIZKAN, emperor of the Tartars, gave an unhappy turn to the affairs of the Chriſtians in the northern parts of *Aſia*, towards the concluſion of this century. This heroic prince, who was by birth a Mogol, and whoſe military exploits raiſe him in the liſt of fame above almoſt all the commanders either of ancient or modern times, rendered his name formidable throughout all *Aſia*, whoſe moſt flouriſhing dynaſties fell ſucceſſively before his victorious arms. DAVID, or UNGCHAN, who, according to ſome, was the ſon, or, as others will have it, the brother, but who was certainly the ſucceſſor of the famous PRESTER JOHN, and was himſelf ſo called in common diſcourſe, was the firſt victim that GENGHIZKAN ſacrificed to his boundleſs ambition. He invaded his territory, and put to flight his troops in a bloody battle, where DAVID loſt, at the ſame time, his kingdom and his life [*f*]. The princes, who governed the Turks, Indians, and the province of *Cathay*, fell, in their turn, before the victorious Tartar, and were all either put to death, or rendered tributary; nor did GENGHIZKAN ſtop here, but proceeding into *Perſia*, *India*, and *Arabia*, he overturned the Saracen dominion in thoſe regions, and ſubſtituted that of the Tartars in its place [*g*]. From this period the Chriſtian cauſe loſt much of its authority and credit in the provinces that had been ruled by PRESTER JOHN and his *ſucceſſor* DAVID, and continued to decline and loſe ground from day to day, until, at length, it ſunk entirely under the weight of oppreſſion, and was ſucceeded in ſome places by the errors of MAHOMET, and in others by the ſuperſtitions of paganiſm. We muſt except, however, in this general account the kingdom of *Tangut*, the chief reſidence of PRESTER JOHN, in which his poſterity, who perſevered in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, maintained, for a long time, a certain ſort of tributary dominion, which exhibited, indeed, but a faint ſhadow of their former grandeur [*h*].

[*f*] The Greek, Latin, and Oriental writers are far from being agreed concerning the year in which the emperor of the Tartars attacked and defeated PRESTER JOHN. The moſt of the Latin writers place this event in the year 1202, and conſequently in the XIII$^{\text{th}}$ century. But MARCUS PAULUS VENETUS (in his book *De Regionibus Orientalibus*, lib. i. cap. li, lii, liii.) and other hiſtorians, whoſe accounts I have followed as the moſt probable, place the defeat of this ſecond PRESTER JOHN in the year 1187. The learned and illuſtrious DEMETRIUS CANTEMIR (in his *Præf. ad Hiſtor. imperii Ottomanici*, p. 45. tom. i. of the French edition) gives an account of this matter different from the two now mentioned, and affirms, upon the authority of the Arabian writers, that GENGHIZKAN did not invade the territories of his neighbours before the year 1214.

[*g*] See PETIT DE LA CROIX, *Hiſtoire de Genghizkan*, p. 120, 121, publiſhed in 12$^{\text{mo}}$ at *Paris* in the year 1711.—HRRBELOT, *Biblioth. Oriental.* at the article GENGHIZKAN, p. 378.—ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 101, & 295.—JEAN DU PLAN CARPIN, *Voyage en Tartarie*, ch. v. in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tom. vii. p. 350.

[*h*] ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 500.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

CENT. XII.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. NOTWITHSTANDING the decline of the Grecian empire, the calamities in which it was frequently involved, and the perpetual revolutions and civil wars that conſumed its ſtrength and were precipitating its ruin, the arts and ſciences ſtill flouriſhed, in *Greece*, and covered with glory ſuch as cultivated them with aſſiduity and ſucceſs. This was owing, not only to the liberality of the emperors, and to the extraordinary zeal which the family of the COMNENI diſcovered for the advancement of learning, but alſo to the provident vigilance of the patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, who took all poſſible meaſures to prevent the clergy from falling into ignorance and ſloth, leſt the Greek church ſhould thus be deprived of able champions to defend its cauſe againſt the Latins. The learned and ingenious commentaries of EUSTATHIUS, biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, upon *Homer*, and DIONYSIUS the *Geographer*, are ſufficient to ſhew the diligence and labour that were employed by men of the firſt genius in the improvement of claſſical erudition and in the ſtudy of antiquity. And if we turn our view towards the various writers who compoſed in this century the hiſtory of their own times, ſuch as CINNAMUS, GLYCAS, ZONARAS, NICEPHORUS, BRYENNIUS, and others, we ſhall find in their productions undoubted marks of learning and genius, as well as of a laudable ambition to obtain the eſteem and approbation of future ages.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

II. Nothing could equal the zeal and enthuſiaſm with which MICHAEL ANCHIALUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, encouraged the ſtudy of philoſophy by his munificence, and ſtill more by the extraordinary influence of his illuſtrious example [a]. It ſeems, however, to have been the Ariſtotelian philoſophy, that was favoured in ſuch a diſtinguiſhed manner by this eminent prelate; and it was in the illuſtration and improvement of this profound and intricate ſyſtem that ſuch of the Greeks, as had a philoſophical turn, were principally employed, as appears evident from ſeveral remains of ancient erudition, and particularly from the commentaries of EUSTRATIUS upon the ethics and other treatiſes of the Grecian ſage. We are not, however, to imagine that the ſublime wiſdom of PLATO was neglected in this century, or that his doctrines were fallen into diſrepute. It appears, on the contrary, that they were adopted by many. Such more eſpecially, as had imbibed the precepts and ſpirit of the Myſtics, preferred them infinitely before the Peripatetic philoſophy, which they conſidered as an endleſs ſource of ſophiſtry and preſumption, while they looked upon the Platonic ſyſtem as the philoſophy of reaſon and piety, of candour and virtue. This diverſity of ſentiments produced the famous controverſy which was managed with ſuch vehemence and erudition among the Greeks, concerning the reſpective merit and excellence of the Peripatetic and Platonic doctrines.

---

[a] THEODORUS BALSAMON, *Præf. ad Photii Nomocanonem in* HENR. JUSTELLI *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*, tom. ii. p. 814.

The ſtate of learning among the Latins.

III. In the weſtern world the purſuit of knowledge was now carried on with incredible emulation and ardour, and all the various branches of ſcience were ſtudied with the greateſt application and induſtry. This literary enthuſiaſm was encouraged and ſupported by the influence and liberality of certain of the European monarchs, and Roman Pontifs, who perceived the happy tendency of the ſciences to ſoften the ſavage manners of uncivilized nations, and thereby to adminiſter an additional ſupport to civil government, as well as an ornament to human ſociety. Hence learned ſocieties were formed, and colleges eſtabliſhed in ſeveral places, in which the liberal arts and ſciences were publicly taught. The prodigious concourſe of ſtudents, who reſorted thither for inſtruction, occaſioned, in proceſs of time, the enlargement of theſe ſchools, which had ariſen from ſmall beginnings, and their erection into *univerſities*, as they were called in the ſucceeding age. The principal cities of *Europe* were adorned with eſtabliſhments of this kind; but *Paris* ſurpaſſed them all in the number and variety of its ſchools, the merit and reputation of its public teachers, and the immenſe multitude of the ſtudious youth that frequented their colleges. And thus was exhibited in that famous city the model of our preſent ſchools of learning; a model indeed defective in ſeveral reſpects, but which, in after times, was corrected and improved, and brought gradually to higher degrees of perfection [*b*]. About the ſame time the famous ſchool of *Angers*, in which the youth were inſtructed in various ſciences, and particularly and principally in the civil law, was founded by the zeal and induſtry of Ulgerius, biſhop of that city [*c*], and the college of *Montpellier*, where law and phyſic were taught with great ſucceſs, had already acquired a conſiderable reputation [*d*]. The ſame literary ſpirit reigned alſo in *Italy*. The academy of *Bolonia*, whoſe origin may certainly be traced higher than this century, was now in the higheſt renown, and was frequented by great numbers of ſtudents, and of ſuch more eſpecially as were deſirous of being inſtructed in the civil and canon laws. The fame of this academy was, in a great meaſure, owing to the munificence of the emperor Lotharius II, who took it under his protection, and enriched it with new privileges and immunities [*e*]. In the ſame province flouriſhed alſo the celebrated ſchool of *Salernum*, where great numbers reſorted, and which was wholly ſet apart for the ſtudy of phyſic. While this zealous emulation, in advancing the cauſe of learning and philoſophy, animated ſo many princes, and prelates, and diſcovered itſelf in the erection of ſo many academies and ſchools of learning, the Roman pontif, ALEXANDER III, was ſeized alſo with this noble enthuſiaſm. In a council held at *Rome* A. D. 1179, he cauſed a ſolemn law to be publiſhed, for the erecting new ſchools in the monaſteries and cathedrals, and reſtoring thoſe which, through the ſloth and ignorance of the monks and biſhops, had fallen into ruin, to their primitive credit and luſtre [*f*]. But the effect which his law was intended to produce was prevented by the growing fame of the new erected academies, to which the youth reſorted from all parts, and left the *epiſcopal* and *monaſtic* ſchools entirely empty, ſo that they gradually declined and ſunk, at laſt, into a total oblivion.

[*b*] De Boulay, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 463.—Pasquier, *Recherches de la France*, livr. iii. ch. xxix.—Petri Lambecii *Hiſtor. Biblioth. Vindobon.* lib. ii. cap. v. p. 260.—*Hiſtoire Litter. de la France*, tom. ix. p. 60—80.

[*c*] Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom ii. p. 215.—Pocquet de la Livoniere, *Diſſert. ſur l'Antiquité de l'Univerſité d'Angers*, p. 21. publiſhed in 4to at *Angers*, 1736.

[*d*] *Hiſtoire Gener. de Languedoc, par les Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 517.

A new diviſion of the ſciences.

IV. Many were the ſignal advantages that attended theſe literary eſtabliſhments; and, what is particularly worthy of notice, they not only rendered knowledge more univerſal by facilitating the means of inſtruction, but were alſo the occaſion of forming a new circle of ſciences, better digeſted, and much more comprehenſive than that which had been hitherto ſtudied by the greateſt adepts in learning. The whole extent of learning and philoſophy, before this period, was confined to the *ſeven liberal arts*, as they were commonly called, of which three were known by the name of the *trivium*, which comprehended *grammar*, *rhetoric*, and *logic*; and the other four by the title of *quadrivium*, which included *arithmetic*, *muſic*, *geometry*, and *aſtronomy*. The greateſt part of the learned, as we have formerly obſerved, were ſatisfied with their literary acquiſitions, when they had made themſelves maſters of the *trivium*, while ſuch as, with an adventurous flight, aſpired after the *quadrivium* were conſidered as ſtars of the firſt magnitude, as the great luminaries of the learned world. But in this century the aſpect of letters underwent a conſiderable and an advantageous change. The number of the *liberal arts* and ſciences was augmented, and new and unfrequented paths of knowledge were opened to the emulation of the ſtudious youth. *Theology* was placed in the number of the ſciences, not that ancient theology which had no merit but its ſimplicity, and which was drawn, without the leaſt order or connexion, from divers paſſages of the holy ſcriptures, and from the opinions and inventions of the primitive doctors, but that *philoſophical* or *ſcholaſtic theology*, that with the deepeſt abſtraction traced divine truth to its firſt principles, and followed it from thence into its various connexions and branches. Nor was theology alone added to the ancient circle of ſciences, the ſtudy of the learned languages, of the civil and canon law, and of phyſic [g], were now brought into high repute. Particular academies were conſecrated to the culture of each of theſe ſciences in various places, and thus it was natural to conſider them as important branches of erudition, and an acquaintance with them as a qualification neceſſary to ſuch as aimed at univerſal learning. All this required a conſiderable change in the diviſion of the ſciences hitherto received; and this change was accordingly brought about. The ſeven *liberal arts* were, by degrees, reduced to one general title, and were comprehended under the name of philoſophy, to which *theology*, *juriſprudence*, and *phyſic* were added. And hence the origin of the four claſſes of ſcience, or, to uſe the academical phraſe, of the four faculties, which took place in the *univerſities* in the following century.

[*e*] The inhabitants of *Bolonia* pretend, that their academy was founded in the vth century by THEODOSIUS II, and they ſhew the *diploma* by which that emperor enriched their city with this valuable eſtabliſhment. But the greateſt part of thoſe writers, who have ſtudied with attention and impartiality the records of ancient times, maintain, that this diploma is a ſpurious production, and alledge many weighty arguments to prove that the academy of *Bolonia* is of no older date than the xith century, and that in the ſucceeding age, particularly from the time of LOTHARIUS II, it received thoſe improvements that rendered it ſo famous throughout all *Europe*. See CAR. SIGONII *Hiſtoria Bononienſis*, as it is publiſhed, with learned obſervations, in the works of that excellent author. MURATORI *Antiqq. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 23. 884. 898.—JUST. HENN. BOHMERI *Præfat. ad Corpus juris Canon.* p. 9, as alſo the elegant *Hiſtory of the Academy of Bolonia*, written in the German language by the learned KEUFELIUS, and publiſhed at *Helmſtadt* in 8°. in the year 1750.

[*f*] See B. BOHMERI *Juſ. Eccleſ. Proteſtant.* tom. iv. p. 705.

The ſtudy of Roman law revived.

V. A happy and unexpected event reſtored in *Italy* the luſtre and authority of the ancient Roman law, and, at the ſame time, leſſened the credit of all the other ſyſtems of legiſlation that had been received for ſeveral ages paſt. This event was the diſcovery of the original manuſcript of the famous *Pandect* of JUSTINIAN, which was found in the ruins of *Amalphi*, or *Melſi*, when that city was taken by LOTHARIUS II, in the year 1137, and of which that emperor made a preſent to the inhabitants of *Piſa*, whoſe fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the ſucceſs of the ſiege. This admirable collection which had been almoſt buried in oblivion, was no ſooner recovered than the Roman law became the grand object of the ſtudies and labours of the learned. In the academy of *Bolonia*, there were particular colleges erected expreſly for the ſtudy of the Roman juriſprudence; and theſe excellent inſtitutions were multiplied in ſeveral parts of *Italy* in proceſs of time, and animated other European nations to imitate ſo wiſe an example. Hence aroſe a great revolution in the public tribunals, and an entire change in their judicial proceedings. Hitherto different ſyſtems of law were followed in different courts, and every perſon of diſtinction, particularly among the Franks, had the liberty of chooſing the body of laws, that was to be the rule of his conduct. But the Roman law acquired ſuch credit and authority, that it ſuperſeded, by degrees, all other laws in the greateſt part of *Europe*, and was ſubſtituted in the place of the Salic, Lombard, and Burgundian codes, which before this period were in the higheſt reputation. It is an ancient opinion, that LOTHARIUS II, purſuant to the counſels and ſollicitations of IRNERIUS [h], principal profeſſor of the Roman law in the academy of *Bolonia*, publiſhed an edict enjoining the abrogation of all the ſtatutes then in force, and ſub-

---

[[g] The word *phyſica*, though, according to its etymology, it denotes the ſtudy of natural philoſophy in general, was, in the XIIth century, applied particularly to medicinal ſtudies, and it has alſo preſerved that limited ſenſe in the Engliſh language.]

[h] Otherwiſe called WERNER.

ſtituting in their place the Roman law, by which, for the future, all without exception were to modify their contracts, terminate their differences, and to regulate their actions. But this opinion, as many learned men have abundantly proved [i], is far from being ſupported by ſufficient evidence.

Eccleſiaſtical or canon law.

VI. No ſooner was the civil law placed in the number of the ſciences, and conſidered as an important branch of academical learning, than the Roman pontifs, and their zealous adherents, judged it not only expedient, but alſo highly neceſſary, that the *canon* law, ſhould have the ſame privilege. There were not wanting before this time certain collections of the *canons* or laws of the church; but theſe collections were ſo deſtitute of order and method, and were ſo defective both with reſpect to matter and form, that they could not be conveniently explained in the ſchools, or be made uſe of as ſyſtems of eccleſiaſtical polity. Hence it was, that GRATIAN, a Benedictine monk, belonging to the convent of St. FELIX and NABOR at *Bolonia*, and by birth a Tuſcan, compoſed about the year 1130, for the uſe of the ſchools, an abridgment, or *Epitome of canon law*, drawn from the letters of the pontifs, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors. Pope EUGENIUS III was extremely ſatisfied with this work, which was alſo received with the higheſt applauſe by the doctors and profeſſors of *Bolonia*, and was unanimouſly adopted, as the text they were to follow in their public lectures. The profeſſors at *Paris* were the firſt that followed the example of thoſe of *Bolonia*, which, in proceſs of time was imitated by the greateſt part of the European colleges. But, notwithſtanding the encomiums beſtowed upon this performance, which was commonly called the *decretal of* GRATIAN [k], and was intitled by the author himſelf, the *reunion or coalition of the jarring canons* [l], ſeveral moſt learned and eminent writers of the Romiſh communion acknowledge, that it is full of errors and defects of various kinds [m]. As, however, the main deſign of this abridgment of the canons was to ſupport the deſpotiſm, and to extend the authority of the Roman pontifs; its innumerable defects were overlooked; its merits were exaggerated; and, what is ſtill more ſurprizing, it enjoys at this day, in an age of light and liberty, that high degree of veneration and authority, which was inconſiderately, though more excuſably, laviſhed upon it in an age of ſpiritual tyranny, ſuperſtition, and darkneſs [n].

---

[i] See HERM. CONRINGIUS, *De origine juris Germanici*, cap. xxii.—GUIDO GRANDUS, *Epiſt. de Pandectis*, p. 21, 69. publiſhed at *Florence* in 4°. in 1737.—HENRY BRENCMANN, *Hiſtoria Pandectar* p. 41.—LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Præf. ad Leges Langobardicas*, *ſcriptor. rerum Italicar* tom. i. part. II. p. 4. & *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom ii p. 285. There was a warm controverſy carried on concerning this matter between GEORGE CALLIXTUS and BARTHOL. NIHUSIUS, the latter of whom embraced the vulgar opinion concerning the edict of LOTHARIUS, obtained by the ſollicitations of IRNERIUS; of this controverſy there is a circumſtantial account in the *Cimbria Litterata* of MÖLLERUS, tom. iii. p. 142.

[k] *Decretum* GRATIANI.

[l] *Concordia Diſcordantium Canonum.*

[m] See, among others, ANTON. AUGUSTINUS, *De Emendatione* GRATIANI, publiſhed in 8vo at *Arnhem*, A. D. 1678, with the learned obſervations of STEPH. BALUZIUS and GER a MASTRICHT.

[n] See GERHARD a MASTRICHT, *Hiſtoria juris Eccleſiaſtici*, § 293. p. 325.—B. JUST. HENN. BÖHMERI *Jus Eccleſ. Proteſtant.* tom. i. p. 100. and more particularly the learned *Preface*, with

VII. Such

The ſtate of philoſophy among the Latins.

VII. Such among the Latins, as were ambitious of making a figure in the republic of letters, applied themſelves, with the utmoſt zeal and diligence, to the ſtudy of philoſophy. Philoſophy, taken in its moſt extenſive and general meaning, comprehended, according to the method which was the moſt univerſally received towards the middle of this century, four claſſes; it was divided into *theoretical*, *practical*, *mechanical*, and *logical*. The firſt claſs comprehended *natural theology*, *mathematics*, and *natural philoſophy*. In the ſecond claſs were ranked *ethics*, *œconomics*, and *politics*. The third contained the ſeven arts that are more immediately ſubſervient to the purpoſes of life, ſuch as *navigation*, *agriculture*, *hunting*, &c. The fourth was divided into *grammar* and *compoſition*, the latter of which was farther ſubdivided into *rhetoric*, *dialectic*, and *ſophiſtry*; and under the term *dialectic* was comprehended that part of *metaphyſic* which treats of *general notions*. This diviſion was almoſt univerſally adopted. Some, indeed, were for ſeparating *grammar* and *mechanics* from *philoſophy*; a ſeparation highly condemned by others, who, under the general term philoſophy, comprehended the whole circle of the ſciences [*o*].

Diſſenſions among the philoſophers.

VIII. The learned, who treated theſe different branches of ſcience, were divided into various factions, which attacked each other with the utmoſt animoſity and bitterneſs [*p*]. There were, at this time, *three* methods of teaching philoſophy that were practiſed by different doctors. The *firſt* was the *ancient* and *plain* method, which confined its reſearches to the philoſophical notions of PORPHYRY, and the *dialectic* ſyſtem, commonly attributed to St. AUGUSTINE, and in which was laid down this general rule, that philoſophical inquiries were to be limited to a ſmall number of ſubjects, leſt, by their becoming too extenſive, religion might ſuffer by a profane mixture of human ſubtilty with its divine wiſdom. The *ſecond* method was called the *Ariſtotelian*, becauſe it conſiſted in explications of the works of that philoſopher [*q*], ſeveral of whoſe books, being tranſlated into Latin, were

---

which this laſt mentioned author enriched the new edition of the *Canon Law*, publiſhed at *Hal*, in 4to. in the year 1747. See alſo ALEX. MACHIAVELLI *Obſervationes ad Sigonii Hiſtor Bononienſem*, tom. iii. *Oper. Sigonii*, p. 128. This writer has drawn from the *Kalendarium Archigymnaſii Bononienſis*, ſeveral particularities concerning GRATIAN and his work, which were generally unknown, but whoſe truth is alſo much diſputed. What increaſes the ſuſpicion of their being fabulous is, that this famous *Kalendar*, of which the Bolonians boaſt ſo much, and which they have ſo often promiſed to publiſh in order to diſpel the doubts of the learned, has never as yet ſeen the light. Beſides, in the fragments that have appeared, there are manifeſt marks of unfair dealing.

[*o*] Theſe literary anecdotes I have taken from ſeveral writers, particularly from HUGO a St. VICTOR, *Didaſcali Libro* ii. cap. ii. p. 7. tom. i. Opp. and from the *Metalogicum* of JOHN of *Saliſbury*.

[*p*] See GODOF. de St. VICTOR. *Carmen de Sectis Philoſoph.* publiſhed by LE BOEUF, in his *Diſſ. ſur l'Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſt. et Civile de Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 254.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 562.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiq. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 51.—JO. SARISBURIENSIS *Metalog. et Policrat.* paſſim.

[*q*] ROB. DE MONTE, *Append. ad Sigebertum Gemblacenſ.* publiſhed by LUC. DACHERIUS, among the works of GUIBERT, abbot of *Nogent*, *ad A.* 1128, p. 753. *Jacobus Clericus de Venecia tranſtulit de Græco in Latinum quoſdam libros Ariſtotelis et commentatus eſt, ſcilicet Topica, Anal. priores et poſteriores et elenchos. Quamvis antiquior tranſlatio ſuper eoſdem libros haberetur.* THOM. BECKET. *Epiſtolar.* lib ii. ep. xciii. p. 454. edit. *Bruxell.* 1682, in 4to. *Itero preces, quatenus libros Ariſtotelis, quos habetis, mihi faciatis exſcribi . . . Precor etiam iterata ſupplicatione, quatenus in*

now almoſt every where in the hands of the learned. Theſe tranſlations were, indeed, extremely obſcure and incorrect, and led thoſe, who made uſe of them in their academical lectures, into various blunders, and often into notions, which were not more abſurd, than whimſical and ſingular. The *third* was termed the *free method*, employed by ſuch as were bold enough to ſearch after truth, in the manner they thought the moſt adapted to render their inquiries ſucceſsful, and who followed the bent of their own genius, without rejecting, however, the ſuccours of ARISTOTLE and PLATO. Laudable as this method was, it became an abundant ſource of ſophiſtry and chicane by the imprudent management of thoſe that employed it; for theſe ſubtile doctors, through a wanton indulgence of their metaphyſical fancies, did little more than puzzle their diſciples with vain queſtions, and fatigue them with endleſs diſtinctions and diviſions [r]. Theſe different ſyſtems, and vehement conteſts that divided the philoſophers, gave many perſons a diſguſt againſt philoſophy in general, and made them deſire, with impatience, its baniſhment from the public ſchools.

The conteſts of the Dialecticians, Realiſts, and Nominaliſts deſcribed.

IX. Of all the controverſies that divided the philoſophers in this century, there were none carried on with greater animoſity, and treated with greater ſubtilty and refinement, than the conteſt of the *Dialectics* concerning *univerſals*. Theſe ſophiſtical doctors were wholly occupied about the intricate queſtions relating to *genus* and *ſpecies*, to the ſolution of which they directed all their philoſophical efforts, and the whole courſe of their metaphyſical ſtudies; but not all in the ſame method, nor upon the ſame principles [s]. The two leading ſects into which they had been divided long before this period, and which were diſtinguiſhed by the titles of *Realiſts* and *Nominaliſts*, not only ſubſiſted ſtill, but were moreover ſubdivided, each into ſmaller parties and factions, according as the two oppoſite and leading ſchemes were modified by new fancies and inventions. The *Nominaliſts*, though they had their followers, were nevertheleſs much inferior to the *Realiſts* both with reſpect to the number of their diſciples, and to the credit and reputation of their doctrine. A third ſect aroſe under the name of *Formaliſts*, who pretended to terminate the controverſy, by ſteering a middle courſe between the two jarring ſyſtems now mentioned; but as the hypotheſis of theſe new doctors was moſt

---

operibus Ariſtotelis, ubi difficiliora fuerint, notulas faciatis, eo quod interpretem aliquatenus ſuſpectum habeo, quia licet eloquens fuerit alias, ut ſæpe audivi, minus tamen fuit in grammatica inſtitutus.

[r] See JO. SARISBERIENSIS *Policrat.* p. 434. *et Metalog.* p. 814, &c.

[s] JOHN of *Saliſbury*, a very elegant and ingenious writer of this age, cenſures, with a good deal of wit, the crude and unintelligible ſpeculations of theſe ſophiſts, in his book entitled, *Policraticon, ſeu de Nugis Curialium* lib. vii. p. 451. He obſerves, that there had been more time conſumed in ſolving the queſtion relating to *genus* and *ſpecies*, than the *Cæſars* had employed in making themſelves maſters of the whole world; that the riches of CROESUS were inferior to the treaſures that had been exhauſted in this controverſy; and that the contending parties, after having ſpent their whole lives upon this ſingle point, had neither been ſo happy as to determine it to their ſatisfaction, nor to make, in the labyrinths of ſcience where they had been groping, any diſcovery that was worth the pains they had taken. His words are: *Veterem paratus eſt ſolvere quæſtionem de generibus et ſpecicbus* (he ſpeaks here of a certain philoſopher) *in qua laborans mundus jam ſenuit, in qua plus temporis conſumtum eſt, quam in acquirendo et regendo orbis imperio conſumſerit Cæſarea domus: plus effuſum pecuniæ, quam in omnibus divitiis ſuis poſſederit Cræſus. Hæc enim tamdiu multos tenuit, ut cum hoc unum tota vita quærerent, tandem nec iſtud, nec aliud invenirent.*

obſcure and unintelligible, they only perplexed matters more than they had hitherto been, and did nothing more than furniſh new ſubjects of contention and diſpute [t].

Thoſe among the learned, who turned their purſuits to more intereſting and beneficial branches of ſcience, than the intricate and puzzling doctrine of *univerſals*, travelled into the different countries, where the kinds of knowledge they were bent upon cultivating, flouriſhed moſt. The ſtudents of phyſic, aſtronomy, and mathematics, continued to frequent the ſchools of the Saracens in *Spain*. Many of the learned productions of the Arabians were alſo tranſlated into Latin [u]; for the high eſteem in which the erudition of that people was held, together with a deſire of converting the Spaniſh Saracens to Chriſtianity, had excited many to ſtudy their language, and to acquire a conſiderable knowledge of their doctrine.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The lives and manners of the clergy.

I. WHEREVER we turn our eyes among the various ranks and orders of the clergy, we perceive, in this century, the moſt flagrant marks of licentiouſneſs and fraud, ignorance and luxury, and other vices whoſe pernicious

---

[t] See the above cited author's *Policrat.* lib. vii. p. 451. where he gives a ſuccinct account of the *Formaliſts*, *Realiſts*, and *Nominaliſts* in the following words: *Sunt qui more mathematicorum* FORMAS *abſtrahunt, et ad illas quicquid de univerſalibus dicitur referunt.* Such were the Formaliſts who applied the doctrine of univerſal ideas to what the mathematicians call *abſtract forms. Alii diſcutiunt* INTELLECTUS *et eos univerſalium nominibus cenſeri confirmant.* Here we find the *Realiſts* pointed out, who, under the name of *univerſals*, comprehended all intellectual powers, qualities, and ideas. *Fuerunt et qui* VOCES *ipſas genera dicerent et ſpecies: ſed eorum jam exploſa ſententia eſt et facile cum autore ſuo evanuit. Sunt tamen adhuc, qui deprehenduntur in veſtigiis eorum, licet erubeſcant vel auctorem vel ſcientiam profiteri,* SOLIS NOMINIBUS *inhærentes, quod rebus et intellectibus ſubtrahunt,* SERMONIBUS *aſcribunt.* This was a ſect of the *Nominaliſts*, who, aſhamed (as this author alledges) to profeſs the exploded doctrine of ROSCELLINUS, which placed *genus* and *ſpecies* in the claſs of *mere words*, or *ſimple denominations*, modified that ſyſtem by a ſlight change of expreſſion only, which did not eſſentially diſtinguiſh their doctrine from that of the ordinary *Nominaliſts.* It appears from all this, that the ſect of the *Formaliſts* is of more ancient date than JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, whom many learned men conſider as its founder. See JO. SARISBER. *Metalogic.* lib. ii. cap. xvii. p 814. where that eminent author deſcribes at large the various conteſts of theſe three ſects, and ſums up their differences in the following words; *Alius conſiſtit in vocibus, licet hæc opinio cum Roſcellino ſuo fere jam evanuerit: alius ſermones intuetur: alius verſatur in intellectibus,* &c.

[u] GERHARD of *Cremona*, who was ſo famous among the Italians for his eminent ſkill in aſtronomy and phyſic, undertook a voyage to *Toledo*, where he trranſlated into Latin ſeveral Arabian treatiſes; ſee MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 936, 937.—MIRMET, a French monk, travelled into *Spain* and *Africa* to learn geography among the Saracens. See LUC. DACHERII *Spicilegium vet. ſcriptor.* tom. ix. p. 443. ed. *Antiq.*—DANIEL MORLACH, an Engliſhman, who was extremely fond of mathematical learning, went a journey to *Toledo*, from whence he brought into his own country a conſiderable number of Arabian books; ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p 55.—PETER, abbot of *Clugni*, ſurnamed the *Venerable*, after having ſojourned for ſome time among the Spaniards in order to make himſelf maſter of the Arabian language, tranſlated into Latin the *Alcoran*, and the *Life of Mahomet*; ſee MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. lib. lxxvii.

pernicious effects were deeply ſelt both in church and ſtate. If we except a very ſmall number, who retained a ſenſe of the ſanctity of their vocation, and lamented the corruption and degeneracy of their order, it may be ſaid, with reſpect to the reſt, that their whole buſineſs was to ſatisfy their luſts, to multiply their privileges by graſping perpetually at new honours and diſtinctions, to increaſe their opulence, to diminiſh the authority, and to encroach upon the privileges of princes and magiſtrates, and, neglecting entirely the intereſts of religion and the cure of ſouls, to live in eaſe and pleaſure, and draw out their days in an unmanly and luxurious indolence. This appears manifeſtly from two remarkable treatiſes of St. BERNARD, in one of which he expoſes the corruption of the pontifs and biſhops [*w*], while he deſcribes in the other the enormous crimes of the monaſtic orders, whoſe licentiouſneſs he chaſtiſes with a juſt ſeverity [*x*].

The pontifs ambitious to extend their authority.

II. The Roman pontifs, who were placed ſucceſſively at the head of the church, governed that ſpiritual and myſtical body by the maxims of carnal and worldly ambition, and thereby fomented the warm conteſt that had already ariſen between the imperial and ſacerdotal powers. On the one hand, the popes not only maintained the opulence and authority they had already acquired, but extended their views farther, and laboured ſtrenuouſly to enlarge both, though they had not all equal ſucceſs in this ambitious attempt. The European emperors and princes, on the other hand, alarmed at the ſtrides which the pontifs were making to univerſal dominion, uſed their utmoſt efforts to diſconcert their meaſures, and to check their growing opulence and power. Theſe violent diſſenſions between the *empire* and the *prieſthood* (for ſo the contending parties were ſtyled n this century) were moſt unhappy in their effects, which were felt throughout all the European provinces. PASCAL II, who had been raiſed to the pontificate about the concluſion of the preceding age, ſeemed now to ſit firm and ſecure in the apoſtolic chair, without the leaſt apprehenſion from the imperial faction, whoſe affairs had taken an unfavorable turn, and who had not the courage to elect a new pope of their party in the place of GUIBERT, who died in the year 1100 [*y*].

The diſpute concing inveſtitures is fomented anew.

PASCAL therefore, unwilling to let paſs unimproved the preſent ſucceſs of the papal faction, renewed, in a council aſſembled at *Rome* A. D. 1102, the decrees of his predeceſſors againſt *inveſtitures*, and the excommunications

---

p. 345. This eminent eccleſiaſtic, as appears from the *Bibliotheca Cluniacenſis*, p. 1169. found, upon his arrival in *Spain*, perſons of learning from *England* and other nations, who applied themſelves with extraordinary aſſiduity and ardor to the ſtudy of aſtrology. We might multiply the examples of thoſe who travelled in queſt of ſcience during this century; but thoſe now alledged are ſufficient for our purpoſe.

[*w*] In the work entitled, *Conſiderationum Libri* v. *ad Eugenium Pontificem.*

[*x*] See his defence of the cruſades under the title of *Apologia ad Guilielmum Abbatem*; as alſo GERHOHUS *De corrupto Eccleſiæ Statu* in BALUZII *Miſcell.* tom. v. p. 63.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 6. *App.* tom. ii. p. 265. 273, &c. BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 490 690.

[(*y*) Dr. MOSHEIM's affirmation here muſt be ſomewhat modified in order to be true; it is certain, that after the death of GUIBERT, the imperial party choſe in his place a perſon named ALBERT, who, indeed, was ſeized the day of his election, and caſt into priſon. THEODORIC and MAGNULF, were ſucceſſively choſen after ALBERT, but could not ſupport for any time their claim to the pontificate. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. lxv. vol. xiv. p. 10. *Bruſſels* edition in 8vo.

they had thundered out againſt HENRY IV, and uſed his moſt vigorous endeavours to raiſe up on all ſides new enemies to that unfortunate emperor. HENRY, however, oppoſed, with great conſtancy and reſolution, the efforts of this violent pontif, and eluded with much dexterity and vigilance his perfidious ſtratagems. But his heart, wounded in the tendereſt part, loſt all its firmneſs and courage, when, in the year 1106, an unnatural ſon, under the impious pretext of religion, took up arms againſt his perſon and his cauſe. HENRY V, ſo was this monſter afterwards named, ſeized his father in a moſt treacherous manner, and obliged him to abdicate the empire; after which the unhappy prince retired to *Liege*, where, deſerted by all his adherents, he departed this life, and ſo got rid of his miſery in the year 1106. It has been a matter of diſpute, whether it was the inſtigation of the pontif, or the ambitious and impatient thirſt after dominion, that engaged HENRY V to declare war againſt his father; nor is it, perhaps, eaſy to decide this queſtion with a perfect degree of evidence. One thing, however, is unqueſtionably certain, and that is, that PASCAL II diſſolved, or rather impiouſly pretended to diſſolve, the oath of fidelity and obedience that HENRY had taken to his father; and not only ſo, but adopted the cauſe and ſupported the intereſts of this unnatural rebel with the utmoſt zeal, aſſiduity, and fervor [z].

The progreſs of this debate.

III. The revolution, that this odious rebellion cauſed in the empire, was, however, much leſs favorable to the views of PASCAL than that lordly pontif expected. HENRY V could by no means be perſuaded to renounce his right of *inveſting* the biſhops and abbots, though he was willing to grant the right of election to the *canons* and *monks*, as was uſual before his time. Upon this the exaſperated pontif renewed, in the councils of *Guaſtalla* and *Troyes*, the decrees that had ſo often been iſſued out againſt *inveſtitures*, and the flame broke out with new force. It was, indeed, ſuſpended during a few years by the wars in which HENRY V was engaged, and which prevented his bringing the matter to an iſſue. But no ſooner had he made peace with his enemies, and compoſed the tumults that troubled the tranquillity of the empire, than he ſet out for *Italy* with a formidable army, A. D. 1110, in order to put an end to this long and unhappy conteſt. He advanced towards *Rome* by ſlow marches, while the trembling pontif ſeeing himſelf deſtitute of all ſuccour, and reduced to the loweſt and moſt defenceleſs condition, propoſed to him the following conditions of peace: That he, on the one hand, ſhould renounce the right of *inveſting* with the *ring* and *croſier*; and that the biſhops and abbots ſhould, on the other hand, reſign and give over to the emperor all the grants they had received from CHARLEMAGNE, of thoſe rights and privileges that belong to royalty, ſuch as the power of raiſing tribute, coining money, and poſſeſſing independent lands and territories, with other immunities of a like nature. Theſe conditions were agreeable to HENRY, who accordingly gave a formal conſent to them in the year 1111; but they were extremely diſpleaſing to the Italian and German biſhops, who expreſſed their diſſent in the ſtrongeſt terms. Hence a terrible tumult aroſe in the church of St. PETER, where the contending parties were aſſembled with their reſpective followers, upon which HENRY ordered the pope to be ſeized, and to be confined in the caſtle of *Viterbo*. After having lain there for ſome time, the captive pontif was engaged, by the unhappy circumſtances of his preſent condition, to enter into a new convention, by which he ſolemnly receded from the article of the former treaty that regarded *inveſtitures*, and confirmed to the emperor the privilege of inaugurating the biſhops and abbots with the *ring* and *croſier*. Thus was the peace concluded, in conſequence of which the vanquiſhed pontif arrayed HENRY with the imperial diadem [*a*].

---

[z] Theſe accounts are drawn from the moſt authentic ſources, and alſo from the eminent writers, whoſe authority I made uſe of, and whoſe names I mentioned in that part of the preceding century that correſponds with the ſubject here treated.

Paſcal breaks this convention and dies.

IV. This tranſitory peace, which was the fruit of violence and neceſſity, was followed by greater tumults and more dreadful wars, than had yet afflicted the church. Immediately after the concluſion of this treaty, *Rome* was filled with the moſt vehement commotions, and a univerſal cry was raiſed againſt the pontif, who was accuſed of having violated, in a ſcandalous manner, the duties and dignity of his ſtation, and of having proſtituted the majeſty of the church by his ignominious compliance with the demands of the emperor. To appeaſe theſe commotions, PASCAL aſſembled, in the year 1112, a council in the church of Lateran, and there not only confeſſed, with the deepeſt contrition and humility, the fault he had committed in concluding ſuch a convention with the emperor, but ſubmitted moreover the deciſion of that matter to the determination of the council, who accordingly took that treaty into conſideration, and ſolemnly annulled it [*b*]. This ſtep was followed by many events that gave, for a long time, an unfavorable turn to the affairs of the emperor. He was excommunicated in many ſynods and councils both in *France* and *Germany*; nay, he was placed in the black liſt of *heretics*, a denomination, which expoſed to the greateſt dangers in theſe ſuperſtitious and barbarous times [*c*]; and, to complete his anxiety, he ſaw the German princes revolting from his authority in ſeveral places, and taking up arms in the cauſe of the church. To put an end to the calamities that thus afflicted the empire on all ſides, HENRY ſet out a ſecond time for *Italy*, with a numerous army, in the year 1116, and arrived the year following at *Rome*, where he aſſembled the conſuls, ſenators, and nobles, while the fugitive pontif retired to *Benevento*. PASCAL, however, during this forced abſence, engaged the Normans to come to his aſſiſtance, and, encouraged by the proſpect of immediate ſuccour, prepared every thing for a vigorous war againſt the emperor, and attempted to make himſelf maſter of *Rome*. But in the midſt of theſe warlike preparations, which drew the attention of *Europe* and portended great and remarkable events, the military pontif yielded to fate, and concluded his days A. D. 1118.

[*a*] Beſides the writers already mentioned, ſee MABILLON *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 681. and tom. vi. p. 1. at the particular years, to which the events here taken notice of, belong.

[*b*] PASCAL, upon this occaſion, as GREGORY VII had formerly done in the caſe of BERENGER, ſubmitted his proceedings and his authority to the judgment of a council, to which, of conſequence, he acknowledged his ſubordination. Nay ſtill more, that council condemned his meaſures, and declared them ſcandalous

[*c*] See GERVAISE, *Diſſ. ſur l'Hereſie des inveſtitures*, which is the *fourth* of the *Diſſertations* which he has prefixed to his *Hiſtory of the Abbot Suger*.

V. A few days after the death of Pascal, John of *Gaieta*, a Benedictine monk of *Montcaſſin*, and chancellor of the Roman church, was raiſed to the pontificate under the title of Gelasius II. In oppoſition to this choice, Henry elected to the ſame high dignity Maurice Burdin, archbiſhop of *Braga* in *Spain* [*d*], who aſſumed the denomination of Gregory VIII [*e*]. Upon this, Gelasius, not thinking himſelf ſafe at *Rome*, nor indeed in *Italy*, ſet out for *France*, and in a little time after died at *Clugni*. The *Cardinals*, who accompanied him in this journey, elected to the papacy, immediately after his departure, Guy archbiſhop of *Vienne*, count of *Burgundy*, who was nearly related to the emperor, and is diſtinguiſhed in the liſt of the Roman pontifs by the name of Callixtus II. The elevation of this eminent eccleſiaſtic was, in the iſſue, extremely happy both for church and ſtate. Remarkably diſtinguiſhed by his illuſtrious birth, and ſtill more by his noble and heroic qualities, this magnanimous pontif continued to oppoſe the emperor with courage and ſucceſs, and to carry on the war both with the ſword of the ſpirit, and with the arm of fleſh. He made himſelf maſter of *Rome*, threw into priſon the pontif that had been choſen by the emperor, and fomented the civil commotions in *Germany*. But his fortitude and reſolution were tempered with moderation, and accompanied with a ſpirit of generoſity and compliance, which differed much from the obſtinate arrogance of his lordly predeceſſors. Accordingly, he lent an ear to pacific counſels, and was willing to relinquiſh a part of the demands upon which the former pontifs had ſo vehemently inſiſted, that he might reſtore the public tranquillity, and ſatiſfy the ardent deſires of ſo many nations, who groaned under the diſmal effects of theſe deplorable diviſions [*f*].

It will appear unqueſtionably evident to every attentive and impartial obſerver of things, that the illiberal and brutiſh manners of thoſe who ruled the church were the only reaſon that rendered the diſpute concerning *inveſtitures* ſo violent and cruel, ſo tedious in its duration, and ſo unhappy in its effects. During the ſpace of five and fifty years, the church was governed by monks, who, to the obſcurity of their birth, the aſperity of their natural temper, and the unbounded rapacity of their ambition and avarice, joined that inflexible obſtinacy which is one of the eſſential characteriſtics of the monaſtic order. Hence thoſe bitter feuds, thoſe furious efforts of ambition and vengeance that diſhonoured the church and afflicted the ſtate during the courſe of this controverſy. But as ſoon as the papal chair was filled by a man of an ingenuous turn, and of a liberal education, the face of things changed entirely, and a proſpect of peace aroſe to the deſires and hopes of ruined and deſolate countries.

[*d*] *Braga* was the metropolis of ancient *Galicia*, but at preſent is one of the three archbiſhoprics of *Portugal*, in the province of *Entre Duero è Migno*. The archbiſhop of that ſee claims the title of primate of *Spain*, which is annexed in *Spain* to the ſee of *Toledo*.]

[*e*] See Stephani Baluzii *Vita Mauritii Burdini Miſcellaneor.* tom. iii. p. 471.

[*f*] The paragraph following is the note [*t*] of the original placed in the text.

VI. Theſe

Peace is concluded between the pope and the emperor upon certain conditions.

VI. Theſe hopes were not diſappointed; for after much conteſtation, peace was, at length, concluded between the emperor and the pope's legates at a general diet held at *Worms* A. D. 1122. The conditions were as follow:
"That for the future the biſhops and abbots ſhall be choſen by thoſe to "whom the right of election belongs [*g*]; but that this election ſhall be "made in preſence of the emperor, or of an ambaſſador appointed by him "for that purpoſe [*h*]:

"That in caſe a diſpute ariſe among the electors, the deciſion of it ſhall "be left to the emperor, who is to conſult with the biſhops upon that "occaſion:

"That the biſhop or abbot elect ſhall take an oath of allegiance to the "emperor, receive from his hand the *regalia*, and do homage for them:

"That the emperor ſhall no more confer the *regalia* by the ceremony of "the *ring* and *croſier*, which are the enſigns of a ſpiritual and ghoſtly dignity, "but by that of the *ſcepter*, which is more proper to inveſt the perſon elected "in the poſſeſſion of rights and privileges merely temporal [*i*]."

This convention was ſolemnly confirmed the year following in the general council of Lateran, and remains ſtill in force in our times; though the true ſenſe of ſome of its articles has occaſioned diſputes between the emperors and pontifs [*k*].

Two popes raiſed at the ſame him to the pontificate.

VII. CALLIXTUS did not long enjoy the fruits of this peace, to which he had ſo much contributed by his prudence and moderation. He departed this life in the year 1124, and was ſucceeded by LAMBERT, biſhop of *Oſtia*, who aſſumed the title of HONORIUS II, and under whoſe pontificate nothing worthy of mention, was tranſacted. His death, which happened A. D. 1130, gave riſe to a conſiderable ſchiſm in the church of *Rome*, or rather in the college of cardinals, of whom one party elected to the papal chair, GREGORY, a cardinal deacon of *St. Angelo*, who was diſtinguiſhed by the name of INNOCENT II, while the other choſe for ſucceſſor to HONORIUS, PETER, the ſon of LEO, a Roman prince, under the title of ANACLETUS II. The party of INNOCENT was far from being numerous in *Rome*, or throughout *Italy* in general, for which reaſon he judged it expedient to retire into *France*, where he had many adherents, and where he ſojourned during the ſpace of two years. His credit was very great out of *Italy*; for beſides the emperor LOTHARIUS, the kings of *England*, *France*, and *Spain*, with other princes, eſpouſed warmly the cauſe of INNOCENT, and that principally by the influence of St. BERNARD, who was his intimate friend, and whoſe counſels had the force and authority of

---

[(*g*) The expreſſion is ambiguous, but it ſignifies that the election of biſhops and abbots was to be made by monks and canons as in former times.]

[*h*] From this period the people in *Germany* were excluded from the right of voting in the election of biſhops. See PETR. DE MARCA *De concordia ſacerdotii et imperii*, lib. vi. cap. ii. § 9. p. 783. ed. *Bohmeri*.

[*i*] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. med. ævi*, tom. vi. p. 76.—SCHILTERUS *De Libertate Eccl. Germanicæ*, lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 545.—CÆSAR RASPONUS *De Baſilica Lateranenſi*, lib. iv. 295.

[*k*] It was diſputed among other things, whether the conſecration of the biſhop elect was to precede, or follow the collation of the regalia? See JO. WILH. HOFFMAN. *ad concordatum Henrici V et Calliſti* II, *Vitemberg.* 1739, in 4to.

laws in almoſt all the countries of *Europe*. The patrons of ANACLETUS were fewer in number, and were confined to the kings of *Sicily* and *Scotland*; his death, however, which happened A. D. 1138, terminated the conteſt, and left INNOCENT in the entire and undiſputed poſſeſſion of the apoſtolic chair. The ſurviving pontif preſided, in the year 1139, at the ſecond council of Lateran, and about four years after ended his days in peace [*l*].

Succeſſion of the pontifs from the death of Innocent to the end of this century.

VIII. After the death of INNOCENT, the Roman ſee was filled by GUY, cardinal of *St. Mark*, who ruled the church about five months, under the title of CELESTINE II. If his reign was ſhort, it was however peaceable, and not like that of his ſucceſſor LUCIUS II, whoſe pontificate was diſturbed by various tumults and ſeditions, and who, about eleven months after his elevation to the papacy, was killed in a riot which he was endeavouring to ſuppreſs by his preſence and authority. He was ſucceeded by BERNARD, a Ciſtertian monk, and an eminent diſciple of the famous St. BERNARD, abbot of *Clairval*. This worthy eccleſiaſtic, who is diſtinguiſhed among the popes by the title of EUGENIUS III, was raiſed to that high dignity in the year 1145, and, during the ſpace of nine years, was involved in the ſame perils and perplexities that had embittered the ghoſtly reign of his predeceſſor. He was often obliged to leave *Rome*, and to ſave himſelf by flight from the fury of the people [*m*], and the ſame reaſon engaged him to retire into *France*, where he ſojourned for a conſiderable time. At length exhauſted by the oppoſition he met with in ſupporting what he looked upon as the prerogatives of the papacy, he departed this life in the year 1153. The pontificate of his ſucceſſor CONRAD, biſhop of *Sabino*, who, after his elevation to the ſee of *Rome*, aſſumed the title of ANASTASIUS IV, was leſs diſturbed by civil commotions, but it was alſo of a very ſhort duration; for ANASTASIUS died about a year and four months after his election.

The conteſt between the emperors and popes is renewed under Frederic Barbaroſſa and Adrian IV.

IX. The warm conteſt between the emperors and the popes, which was conſidered as at an end ever ſince the time of CALLIXTUS II, was unhappily renewed under the pontificate of ADRIAN IV, who was a native of *England*, and whoſe original name was NICOLAS BREAKSPEAR. FREDERIC I, ſurnamed *Barbaroſſa*, was no ſooner ſeated on the imperial throne, than he publicly declared his reſolution to maintain the dignity and privileges of the Roman empire in general, and more particularly to render it reſpectable in *Italy*; nor was he at all ſtudious to conceal the deſign he had formed of reducing the overgrown power and opulence of the pontifs and clergy within narrower limits. ADRIAN perceived the danger that threatned the majeſty of the church, and the authority of the clergy, and prepared himſelf for defending both which vigour and conſtancy. The firſt occaſion of trying their ſtrength was offered at the coronation of the emperor at *Rome*, in the year 1155, when the pontif inſiſted upon FREDERIC's performing the office of equerry, and holding the ſtirrup to his Holineſs. This humbling propoſal was at firſt rejected with diſdain by the emperor, and was followed by other conteſts of a more momentous nature relating to the political intereſts of the empire. Theſe differences were no ſooner reconciled than new diſputes equally important aroſe in the year 1158, when the emperor, in order to put a ſtop to the enormous opulence of the pontifs, biſhops, and monks, which increaſed from day to day, enacted a law to prevent the transferring of *fiefs* without the knowledge and conſent of the ſuperior or lord in whoſe name they were held [*n*], and turned the whole force of his arms to reduce the little republics of *Italy* under his dominion. An open rupture between the emperor and the pontif was expected as the inevitable conſequence of ſuch vigorous meaſures, when the death of ADRIAN, which happened on the firſt of September, A. D. 1159, ſuſpended the ſtorm [*o*].

[*l*] Beſides the ordinary writers of the papal hiſtory, ſee JEAN DE LANNES *Hiſtoire du Pontificat du Pape Innocent* II. *Pariſ.* 1741, in 8°.

[(*m*) There was a party formed in *Rome* at this time, whoſe deſign was to reſtore the Roman ſenate to its former privileges and to its ancient ſplendor and glory; and, for this purpoſe, to reduce the papal revenues and prerogatives to a narrower compaſs, even to the tithes and oblations that were offered to the primitive biſhops, and to the ſpiritual government of the church, attended with an utter excluſion from all civil juriſdiction over the city of *Rome*. It was this party that produced the feuds and ſeditions to which Dr. MOSHEIM has an eye in this eighth ſection.]

A diſpute ariſes in the election of a new pontif.

X. In the election of a new pontif the cardinals were divided into two factions. The moſt numerous and powerful of the two raiſed to the pontificate ROLAND, biſhop of *Sienna*, who aſſumed the name of ALEXANDER III, while the oppoſite party elected to that high dignity OCTAVIAN, cardinal of *St. Cecilia*, known by the title of VICTOR IV. The latter was patroniſed by the emperor, to whom ALEXANDER was extremely diſagreeable on ſeveral accounts. The council of *Pavia*, which was aſſembled by the emperor in the year 1160, adopted his ſentiments, and pronounced in favour of VICTOR, who became thereby triumphant in *Germany* and *Italy*; ſo that *France* alone was left open to ALEXANDER, who accordingly left *Rome*, and fled thither for ſafety and protection. Amidſt the tumults and commotions which this ſchiſm occaſioned, VICTOR died at *Lucca* in the year 1164, but his place was immediately filled by the emperor, at whoſe deſire GUY, cardinal of *St. Calixtus*, was elected pontif under the title of PASCAL III, and acknowledged in that character by the German princes aſſembled in the year 1167, at the diet of *Wurtzbourg*. In the mean time ALEXANDER recovered his ſpirits, and returning into *Italy* maintained his cauſe with uncommon reſolution and vigour, and not without ſome promiſing hopes of ſucceſs. He held at *Rome*, in the year 1167, the council of Lateran, in which he ſolemnly depoſed the emperor (whom he had, upon ſeveral occaſions before this period, loaded publicly with anathemas and execrations) diſſolved the oath of allegiance which his ſubjects had taken to him as their lawful ſovereign, and encouraged and exhorted them to rebel againſt his authority, and to ſhake off his yoke. But ſoon after this audacious proceeding, the emperor made himſelf maſter of *Rome*, upon which the inſolent pontif fled to *Benevento*, and left the apoſtolic chair to PASCAL, his competitor.

[*n*] This prohibition of transferring the poſſeſſion of *fiefs*, from one to another without the conſent of the ſupreme lord, or ſovereign, under whom they were held, together with other laws of a like nature, was the firſt effectual barrier that was oppoſed to the enormous and growing opulence and authority of the clergy. See MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 239.

[*o*] See the accurate and circumſtantial account of this whole affair that is given by the illuſtrious and learned Count BUNAU, in his *Hiſtory of Frederic* I, wrote in German, p. 45. 49. 73. 99. 105, &c.

XI. The affairs of ALEXANDER ſeemed to take ſoon after a more proſperous turn, when the greateſt part of the imperial army being conſumed by a peſtilential diſorder, the emperor was forced to abandon *Italy*, and when the death of PASCAL, which happened in the year 1168, delivered him from ſuch a powerful and formidable rival. But this fair proſpect ſoon vaniſhed. For the imperial faction elected to the pontificate JOHN, abbot of *Strum*, under the title of CALLIXTUS III, whom FREDERIC, notwithſtanding his abſence in *Germany*, and the various wars and diſputes in which he was involved, ſupported to the utmoſt of his power. When peace was, in a good meaſure, reſtored in the empire, FREDERIC marched into *Italy*, A. D. 1174, with a deſign to chaſtiſe the perfidy of the ſtates and cities that had revolted during his abſence, and ſeized the firſt favorable opportunity of throwing off his yoke. Had this expedition been crowned with the expected ſucceſs, ALEXANDER would, undoubtedly, have been obliged to deſiſt from his pretenſions, and to yield the papal chair to CALLIXTUS. But the event came far ſhort of the hopes which this grand expedition had excited, and the emperor, after having, during the ſpace of three years, been alternately defeated and victorious, was, at length, ſo fatigued with the hardſhips he had ſuffered, and ſo dejected at a view of the difficulties he had yet to overcome, that, in the year 1177, he concluded a treaty of peace at *Venice* with ALEXANDER III, and a truce with the reſt of his enemies [p]. Certain writers affirm, that upon this occaſion the haughty pontif trod upon the neck of the ſuppliant emperor, while he kiſſed his foot, repeating at the ſame time thoſe words of the royal Pſalmiſt: *Thou ſhalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon ſhalt thou trample under feet* [q]. The greateſt part, however, of modern authors have called this event in queſtion, and conſider it as utterly deſtitute of authority and unworthy of credit [r].

A miſunderſtanding ariſes between Alexander III and Henry II king of *England*.

XII. ALEXANDER III, who was rendered ſo famous by his long and ſucceſsful conteſt with FREDERIC I, was alſo engaged in a warm diſpute with HENRY II, king of *England*, which was occaſioned by the arrogance of THOMAS BECKET, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. In the council of *Clarendon*, which was held in the year 1164, ſeveral laws were enacted, by which the king's power and juriſdiction over the clergy were accurately explained, and the rights and privileges of the biſhops and prieſts reduced within narrower bounds [s]. BECKET refuſed obedience to theſe laws, which he looked upon

---

[p] All the circumſtances of theſe conventions are accurately related by the abovementioned Count BUNAU, in his *Hiſtory of Frederic* I, p. 115—242.—See alſo FORTUNATI OLMI *Iſtoria della Venuta à Venetia occultamente nel A.* 1177, *di Papa Aleſſandro* III. *Venit.* 1629, in 4to.—MURATORI *Antiqq. Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. iv. p. 249.—*Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. ii. p. 379.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *April.* p. 46. *in Vita Hugonis, abbatis Bonæ vallis*, & tom. ii. *April. in Vita Galdini Mediolanenſis*, p. 596. two famous eccleſiaſtics, who were employed as ambaſſadors and arbiters in the treaty of peace here mentioned.

[q] Pſalm xci. 13.

[r] See BUNAU's *Life of Frederic* I, p. 242.—HEUMANNI *Pœciles* tom. iii. lib. i. p. 145.—*Bibliotheque Italique*, tom. vi. p. 5. as alſo the authors mentioned by CASPAR. SAGITTARIUS, in his *Introduct. in Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* tom. i. p. 630. tom. ii. p. 600.

[s] See MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major.* p. 82, 83. 101. 114.—DAV. WILKINS, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 434.

[HENRY II had formed the wiſe project of bringing the clergy under the juriſdiction of the civil as prejudicial to the *divine* rights of the church in general, and to the prerogatives of the Roman pontifs in particular. Upon this there aroſe a vio-

courts, on account of the ſcandalous abuſe they had made of their immunities, and the crimes which the eccleſiaſtical tribunals let paſs with impunity. The *Conſtitutions of Clarendon*, which conſiſted of XVI articles, were drawn up for this purpoſe: And as they are proper to give the reader a juſt idea of the prerogatives and privileges that were claimed equally by the king and the clergy, and that occaſioned, of conſequence, ſuch warm debates between ſtate and church, it will not be altogether uſeleſs to tranſcribe them here at length.

I. When any difference relating to the right of patronage ariſes between the laity, or between the *clergy* and *laity*, the controverſy is to be tried and ended in the *King's Court*.

II. Thoſe churches which are *fees* of the crown cannot be granted away in perpetuity without the king's conſent.

III. When the *clergy* are charged with any miſdemeanor, and ſummoned by the juſtitiary, they ſhall be obliged to make their appearance in his court, and plead to ſuch parts of the indictment as ſhall be put to them; and likewiſe to anſwer ſuch articles in the Eccleſiaſtical Court as they ſhall be proſecuted for by that juriſdiction: Always provided, that the king's juſtitiary ſhall ſend an officer to inſpect the proceedings of the Court Chriſtian. And in caſe any *clerk* is convicted, or pleads guilty, he is to forfeit the privilege of his character, and to be protected by the church no longer.

IV. No archbiſhops, biſhops, or parſons are allowed to depart the kingdom, without a licence from the crown; and, provided they have leave to travel, they ſhall give ſecurity, not to act or ſolicit any thing during their paſſage, ſtay, or return, to the prejudice of the king, or kingdom.

V. When any of the laity are proſecuted in the Eccleſiaſtical Courts, the charge ought to be proved before the biſhop by legal and reputable witneſſes: and the courſe of the proceſs is to be ſo managed, that the archdeacon may not loſe any part of his right, or the profits accruing to his office: and, if any offenders appear ſkreened from proſecution upon the ſcore either of favour or quality, the ſheriff, at the biſhop's inſtance, ſhall order twelve ſufficient men of the neighbourhood to make oath before the biſhop, that they will diſcover the truth according to the beſt of their knowledge.

VI. Excommunicated perſons ſhall not be obliged to make oath, or give ſecurity to continue upon the place where they live: but only to abide by the judgment of the church in order to their abſolution.

VII. No perſon that *holds in chief of the king*, or any of his barons, ſhall be excommunicated, or any of their eſtates put under an *interdict*, before application made to the king, provided he is in the kingdom; and in caſe his highneſs be out of *England*, then the juſtitiary muſt be acquainted with the diſpute, in order to make ſatisfaction: and thus what belongs to the cognizance of the King's Court, muſt be tried there; and that which belongs to the Court Chriſtian, muſt be remitted to that juriſdiction.

VIII. In caſe of appeals in eccleſiaſtical cauſes, the firſt ſtep is to be made from the archdeacon to the biſhop: and from the biſhop to the archbiſhop: and, if the archbiſhop fails to do juſtice, a farther recourſe may be had to the king, by whoſe order the controverſy is to be finally decided in the Archbiſhop's Court. Neither ſhall it be lawful for either of the parties to move for any farther remedy without leave from the crown.

IX. If a difference happens to ariſe between any clergyman and layman concerning any tenement; and that the clerk pretends it held by *frank-almoine* *, and the layman pleads it a *lay-fee*; in this caſe the tenure ſhall be tried by the enquiry and verdict of twelve ſufficient men of the neighbourhood, ſummoned according to the cuſtom of the realm. And, if the tenement or thing in controverſy ſhall be found *frank-almoine*, the diſpute concerning it ſhall be tried in the Eccleſiaſtical Court. But, if it is brought in a *lay-fee*, the ſuit ſhall be followed in the King's Courts, unleſs both the plaintif and defendant hold the tenement in queſtion of the ſame biſhop; in which caſe, the cauſe ſhall be tried in the court of ſuch biſhop or baron, with this farther proviſo, that he who is ſeized of the thing in controverſy, ſhall not be diſſeized hanging the ſuit (i. e. *during the ſuit, pendente lite)* upon the ſcore of the verdict abovementioned.

X. He who holds of the king in any city, caſtle, or borough, or reſides upon any of the demeſne-lands of the crown, in caſe he is cited by the archdeacon or biſhop to anſwer any miſbehaviour belonging to their cognizance; if he refuſes to obey their ſummons, and ſtand to the ſentence of the court, it ſhall be lawful for the ordinary to put him under an interdict, but not to excommunicate him, till the king's principal officer of the town ſhall be preacquainted with the caſe, in order to en-lent debate between the reſolute monarch and the rebellious prelate, which obliged the latter to retire into *France*, where Alexander III was at that time in a kind of exile. This pontif and the king of *France* interpoſed their good offices in order to compoſe theſe differences, in which they ſucceeded ſo far, after much trouble and difficulty, as to encourage Becket to return into *England*, where he was re-inſtated in his forfeited dignity. But the generous and indulgent proceedings of his ſovereign towards him were not ſufficient to conquer his arrogant and rebellious obſtinacy in maintaining, what he called, the privileges of the church, nor could he be induced, by any means, to comply with the views and meaſures of Henry. The conſequences of this inflexible reſiſtance were fatal to the haughty prelate, for he was ſoon, after his return into *England*, aſſaſſinated before the altar, while he was at veſpers in his cathedral by four perſons, who certainly did not commit

---

* *i. e.* A tenure by divine ſervice, as *Britton* explains it.

---

join him to make ſatisfaction to the church. And, if ſuch officer or magiſtrate ſhall fail in his duty, he ſhall be fined by the king's judges. And then the biſhop may exert his diſcipline on the refractory perſon as he thinks fit.

XI. All archbiſhops, biſhops, and eccleſiaſtical perſons, who hold of the king in chief, and the tenure of a barony, are for that reaſon obliged to appear before the king's juſtices and miniſters to anſwer the duties of their tenure, and to obſerve all the uſages and cuſtoms of the realm; and, like other barons, are bound to be preſent at trials in the King's Court, till ſentence is to be pronounced for the loſing of life or limbs.

XII. When any archbiſhoprick, biſhoprick, abby, or priory of royal foundation becomes vacant, the king is to make ſeizure: from which time, all the profits and iſſues are to be paid into the Exchequer, as if they were the demeſne-lands of the crown. And when it is determined, the vacancy ſhall be filled up, the king is to ſummon the moſt conſiderable perſons of the chapter to Court, and and the election is to be made in the chapel royal, with the conſent of our ſovereign lord the king, and by the advice of ſuch perſons of the government, as his highneſs ſhall think fit to make uſe of. At which time, the perſon elected, before his conſecration, ſhall be obliged to do homage and fealty to the king, as his liege lord; which homage ſhall be performed in the uſual form, with a clauſe for the ſaving the privilege of his order.

XIII. If any of the temporal barons, or great men, ſhall encroach upon the rights or property of any archbiſhop, biſhop, or archdeacon, and refuſe to make ſatisfaction for wrong done by themſelves, or their tenants, the king ſhall do juſtice to the party aggrieved. And, if any perſon ſhall diſſeize the king of any part of his lands, or treſpaſs upon his prerogative, the archbiſhops, biſhops, and archdeacons ſhall call him to an account, and oblige him to make the crown reſtitution. i. e. *They were to excommunicate ſuch diſſeizers and injurious perſons in caſe they proved refractory and incorrigible.*

XIV. The goods and chattels of thoſe who lie under forfeitures of felony or treaſon are not to be detained in any church or church-yard, to ſecure them againſt ſeizure and juſtice; becauſe ſuch goods are the king's property, whether they are lodged within the precincts of a church or without it.

XV. All actions and pleas of debt, though never ſo ſolemn in the circumſtances of the contract, ſhall be tried in the King's Courts.

XVI. The ſons of copy-holders are not to be ordained, without the conſent of the lord of the manor where they were born.

Such were the articles of the conſtitutions of *Clarendon*, againſt the greateſt part of which the pope proteſted. They were ſigned by the Engliſh clergy and alſo by Becket. The latter, however, repented of what he had done, and retiring from court, ſuſpended himſelf from his office in the church for about forty days, till he received abſolution from Alexander III, who was then at *Sens*. His averſion to theſe articles manifeſted itſelf by an open rebellion againſt his ſovereign, in which he diſcovered his true character, as a moſt daring, turbulent, vindictive, and arrogant prieſt, whoſe miniſtry was ſolely employed in extending the deſpotic dominion of *Rome*, and whoſe fixed purpoſe was to aggrandize the church upon the ruins of the ſtate. See Collier's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, vol. i. xiith century. Rapin Thoyras, in the reign of Henry II.]

this act of violence without the king's knowledge and connivance [t]. This event produced warm debates between the king of *England* and the Roman pontif, who gained his point ſo far as to make the ſuppliant monarch undergo a ſevere courſe of penance in order to expiate a crime of which he was conſidered as the principal promoter, while the murthered prelate was ſolemnly enrolled in the higheſt rank of ſaints and martyrs in the year 1173 [u].

Alexander III contributes by prudent counſels to confirm the privileges of the church, and to extend the papal authority.

XIII. It was not only by force of arms, but alſo by uninterrupted efforts of dexterity and artifice, by wiſe counſels and prudent laws, that ALEXANDER III maintained the pretended rights of the church, and extended the authority of the Roman pontifs. For in the third council of the Lateran held at *Rome* A. D. 1179, the following decrees, among many others upon different ſubjects, were paſſed by his advice and authority: *1ſt*, That in order to put an end to the confuſion and diſſenſions, which ſo often accompanied the election of the Roman pontifs, the right of election ſhould not only be veſted in the *cardinals* alone, but alſo that the perſon, in whoſe favour two thirds of the college of cardinals voted, ſhould be conſidered as the lawful and duly elected pontif. This law is ſtill in force; it was therefore from the time of ALEXANDER that the election of the pope acquired that form which it ſtill retains, and by which not only the people but alſo the Roman clergy, are excluded entirely from all ſhare in the honour of conferring that important dignity. *2dly*, A ſpiritual war was declared againſt Heretics, whoſe numbers increaſing conſiderably about this time, created much diſturbance in the church in general, and infeſted, in a more

---

[(t) This aſſertion is, in our opinion, by much too ſtrong. It can only be founded upon certain indiſcreet and paſſionate expreſſions, which the intolerable inſolence and frenetic obſtinacy of BECKET drew from HENRY in an unguarded moment, when, after having received new affronts, notwithſtanding the reconciliation he had effected with ſo much trouble and condeſcenſion, he expreſſed himſelf to this purpoſe: *Am I not unhappy that, among the numbers, who are attached to my intereſts, and employed in my ſervice, there is none poſſeſſed of ſpirit enough to reſent the affronts which I am conſtantly receiving from a miſerable prieſt?* Theſe words, indeed, were not prononnced in vain. Four gentlemen of the court, whoſe names were *Fitz-Urſe*, *Tracy*, *Britton*, and *Morville*, murdered BECKET in his chapel, and thus performed, in a licentious and criminal manner, an action which the laws might have commanded with juſtice. But it is extremely remarkable, that after the murder the aſſaſſins were afraid they had gone too far, and durſt not return to the king's court, which was then in *Normandy*; but retired, at firſt, to *Knareſborough* in *Yorkſhire*, which belonged to *Morville*, from whence they repaired to *Rome* for abſolution, and being admitted to penance by ALEXANDER III, were ſent, by the orders of that pontif, to *Jeruſalem*, and paſſed the remainder of their lives upon the *Black Mountain* in the ſevereſt acts of auſterity and mortification. All this does not look as if the king had been deliberately concerned in this murder, or had expreſly conſented to it. See RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtory of England*; COLLIER'S *Eccleaſiſtical Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p 370. * The authors, which Dr. MOSHEIM refers to for an account of this matter, are as follow: GUILIEL. STEPHANIDÆ *Hiſtoria Thomæ Cantuarienſis* in SPARKS *Scriptores rerum Anglicarum*, publiſhed in folio at *London* in the year 1723.—CHRIST. LUPI *Epiſtolæ et vita Thomæ Cantuar.*—*Epiſtolæ Alexandri* III, *Ludovici* VII, *Henrici* II, *in hac cauſa ex MSS Vaticano, Bruxellis* 1682, 2 vol. 4to.—NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Capitib. Sæc.* xii. *Dſſ.* x. p. 833.—THOMÆ STAPLETONI *Tres Thomæ, ſeu res Geſtæ Thomæ Apoſtoli, S. Thomæ Cantuarienſis, et Thomæ Mori. Colon.* 1612, in 8vo.

[u] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 328. et *De Die Feſto ejus*, p. 397.—DOM. COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 249.

* Dr. SMOLLET tells us, that the king ſuſpecting the deſign of theſe four gentlemen by the privacy of their departure from his court, diſpatched meſſengers to overtake, and forbid them, in his name to commit any violence; but the conſpirators had already taken ſhipping, and the orders arrived too late in *England* to prevent their deſign's being executed. See SMOLLET's *Hiſtory of England*, vol. i. p. 332.

particular manner, ſeveral provinces in *France*, which groaned under the fatal diſſenſions that accompanied the propagation of their errors [w]. *3dly*, The right of recommending and nominating to the ſaintly order was alſo taken away from councils and biſhops, and *canoniſation* was ranked among the *greater and more important cauſes*; the cognizance of which belonged to the pontif alone [x]. To all this we muſt not forget to add, that the power of erecting new kingdoms, which had been claimed by the pontifs from the time of GREGORY VII, was not only aſſumed, but alſo exerciſed by ALEXANDER in a remarkable inſtance; for in the year 1179, he conferred the title of king, with the enſigns of royalty, upon ALPHONSO I, duke of *Portugal*, who, under the pontificate of LUCIUS II, had rendered his province tributary to the Roman ſee [y].

His ſucceſſors

XIV. Upon the death of ALEXANDER, UBALD, biſhop of *Oſtia*, otherwiſe known by the name of LUCIUS III, was raiſed to the pontificate, A. D. 1181, by the ſuffrages of the cardinals alone, in conſequence of the law mentioned in the preceding ſection. The adminiſtration of this new pontif was embittered by violent tumults and ſeditions; for he was twice driven out of the city by the Romans, who could not bear a pope that was elected, in oppoſition to the ancient cuſtom, without the knowledge and conſent of the clergy and the people. In the midſt of theſe troubles he died at *Verona* in the year 1185, and was ſucceeded by HUBERT CRIVELLI, biſhop of *Milan*, who aſſumed the title of URBAN III, and, without having tranſacted any thing worthy of mention during his ſhort pontificate, died of grief in the year 1187, upon hearing that SALADIN had made himſelf maſter of *Jeruſalem*. The pontificate of his ſucceſſor ALBERT [z], whoſe papal denomination was GREGORY VIII, exhibited ſtill a more ſtriking inſtance of the fragility of human grandeur; for this pontif yielded to fate about two months after his elevation. He was ſucceeded by PAUL, biſhop of *Preneſte*, who filled the papal chair above three years under the title of CLEMENT III, and departed this life A. D. 1191, without having diſtinguiſhed his ghoſtly reign by any memorable achievement, if we except his zeal for draining *Europe* of its treaſures and inhabitants by the publication of new *cruſades*. CELESTINE III [*a*], makes a more ſhining figure in hiſtory than the pontifs we have been now mentioning; for he thundered his excommunications againſt the emperor, HENRY VI, and LEOPOLD, duke of *Auſtria*, on account of their having ſeized and impriſoned RICHARD I, king of *England*, as he was returning from the Holy Land; he alſo ſubjected to the ſame malediction ALPHONSO X, king of *Gallicia* and *Leon*, on account of an inceſtuous marriage into which that prince had entered, and commanded PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of *France*, to re-admit to the conjugal ſtate and honours INGELBURG his queen, whom he had divorced for reaſons unknown; though this order, indeed, produced but little effect [*b*]. But the moſt illuſtrious and reſolute pontif, that filled the papal chair during this century, and whoſe exploits made the greateſt noiſe in *Europe*, was LOTHARIUS, count of *Segni*, cardinal deacon, otherwiſe known by the name of INNOCENT III. The arduous undertakings, and bold achievements of this eminent pontif, who was placed at the head of the church in the year 1198, belong to the hiſtory of the following century.

---

[w] See NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Capit. Sæc.* xii. *Diſſ.* ix. p. 819. where he treats particularly concerning this council.—See alſo *tom.* vi. part. II. *Conciliorum* HARDUINI, p. 1671.

[(w) Dr. MOSHEIM, as alſo SPANHEIM and FLEURY, call this the 3d council of Lateran, whereas other hiſtorians mention eight preceding councils held in the Lateran, *viz.* Thoſe of the years 649, 864, 1105, 1112, 1116, 1123, 1139, 1167. Our author has alſo attributed to this council of 1179, decrees that probably belong to a later period.]

[x] See what has been obſerved already, under the xth century, concerning the election of the popes, and the *canonization* of ſaints.

[y] BARONIUS, *Annal. ad A.* 1179.—INNOCENTII III, *Epiſtolæ Lib.* ep. xlix. p. 54. tom. i. ed. *Baluzian.*

[(y) ALPHONSO had been declared by his victorious army, king of *Portugal*, in the year 1136, in the midſt of the glorious exploits he had performed in the war againſt the *Moors*; ſo that ALEXANDER III did no more than confirm this title by an arrogant bull, in which he treats that excellent prince as his vaſſal.]

[z] This prelate, before his elevation to the papacy, was biſhop of *Benevento*, and chancellor of the Roman church.

A view of the other eccleſiaſtical orders, and their vices.

XV. If from the ſeries of pontifs that ruled the church in this century, we deſcend to the other eccleſiaſtical orders, ſuch as the biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, the moſt diſagreeable objects will be exhibited to our view. The unanimous voice of the hiſtorians of this age, as well as the laws and decrees of ſynods and councils declare loudly the groſs ignorance, the odious frauds, and the flagitious crimes that reigned among the different ranks and orders of the clergy now mentioned. It is not therefore at all ſurprizing, that the monks, whoſe rules of diſcipline obliged them to a regular method of living, and placed them out of the way of many temptations to licentiouſneſs, and occaſions of ſinning to which the epiſcopal and ſacerdotal orders were expoſed, were held in higher eſteem than they were. The reign of corruption became, however, ſo general, that it reached at laſt even the convents; and the monks, who were gaining with the moſt ardent efforts the ſummit of eccleſiaſtical power and authority, and who beheld both the *ſecular clerks*, and the *regular canons* with averſion and contempt [*c*], began in many places, to degenerate from that ſanctity of manners, and that exact obedience to their rules of diſcipline by which they had been formerly diſtinguiſhed, and to exhibit to the people ſcandalous examples of immorality and vice [*d*]. The Benedictines of *Clugni*, who undoubtedly ſurpaſſed, in regularity of conduct and purity of manners all the monaſtic orders who lived under their rule, maintained their integrity for a long time amidſt the general decay of piety and virtue. They were however at length carried away with the torrent; ſeduced by the example of their abbot Pontius, and corrupted by the treaſures that were poured daily into their convent by the liberality of the opulent and pious, they fell from their primitive auſterity, and, following the diſſolute examples of the other Benedictines, they *gave themſelves up to pleaſure and dwelt careleſsly* [e]. Several of the ſucceeding abbots endeavoured to remedy this diſſorder, and to recover the declining reputation of their convent; but their efforts were much leſs ſucceſsful than they expected, nor could the monks of *Clugni* ever be brought back to their primitive ſanctity and virtue [f].

[*a*] Whoſe name was HYACINTH, a native of *Rome*, and a cardinal deacon.

[(*b*) It was in conſequence of the vigorous and terrible proceedings of INNOCENT III, that the reunion between PHILIP and INGELBURG was accompliſhed. See *L'Hiſtoire de France, par l'Abbé* VELLY, tom. iii. p. 367, 368, 369.]

[*c*] See RUPERTI *Epiſtola* in MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecd.* tom. i. p. 285. This writer prefers the monks before the apoſtles.

[*d*] See BERNARD. *Conſideration. ad Eugenium*, lib. iii. cap. iv.—See alſo the *Speculum Stultorum*, or *Brunellus*, a Poem, compoſed by NIGEL WIREKER, an Engliſh bard of no mean reputation, who lived about the middle of the XIIth century. In this Poem, of which ſeveral editions have been publiſhed, the different orders of monks are ſeverely cenſured; the Carthuſians alone have eſcaped the keen and virulent Satire of this witty writer.

The proſperous ſtate of the Ciſtertian Order.

XVI. The *Ciſtertian Order*, which was much inferior to the monks of *Clugni*, both with reſpect to the antiquity of their inſtitution, and the poſſeſſions and revenues of their convent, ſurpaſſed them far in the external regularity of their lives and manners, and in a certain ſtriking air of innocence and ſanctity which they ſtill retained, and which the others had almoſt entirely loſt. Hence they acquired that high degree of reputation and authority, which the order of *Clugni* had formerly enjoyed, and increaſed daily in number, credit, and opulence. The famous St. Bernard, abbot of *Clairval*, whoſe influence throughout all *Europe* was incredible, whoſe word was a law, and whoſe counſels were regarded by kings and princes as ſo many orders to which the moſt reſpectful obedience was due; this eminent eccleſiaſtic was the perſon who contributed moſt to enrich and aggrandize the Ciſtertian Order. Hence he is juſtly conſidered as the ſecond parent and founder of that Order; and hence the Ciſtertians not only in *France*, but alſo in *Germany*, and other countries were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Bernardin monks* [g]. A hundred and ſixty religious communities derive their origin, or their rules of diſcipline, from this illuſtrious abbot, and he left, at his death, ſeven hundred monks in the monaſtery of *Clairval*. The church abounded with biſhops and archbiſhops that had been formed and prepared for the miniſtry by his inſtructions, and he counted alſo, among the number of his diſciples, Eugenius III, one of the beſt and wiſeſt of the Roman pontifs.

Jealouſies ariſe between the Ciſtertians and the monks of *Clugni*.

XVII. The growing proſperity of the *Ciſtertian Order*, excited the envy and jealouſy of the monks of *Clugni*, and, after ſeveral diſſenſions of leſs conſequence, produced at length an open rupture, a declared war between theſe two opulent and powerful monaſteries. They both followed the rule of St. Benedict, though they differed in their habit, and in certain laws, which the Ciſtertians, more eſpecially, had added to that rule. The monks of *Clugni* accuſed the *Ciſtertians* of affecting an extravagant auſterity in their manners and diſcipline; while the *Ciſtertians*, on the other hand, charged them, and that upon very good grounds, with having degenerated from their former ſanctity, and regularity of conduct. St. BERNARD, who was the oracle and protector of the Ciſtertians, wrote, in the year 1127, an *Apology* for his own conduct in relation to the diviſion that ſubſiſted between the two convents, and inveighed with a juſt, though decent, ſeverity againſt the vices that had corrupted the monks of *Clugni* [h]. This charge was anſwered, though with uncommon moderation and candour by PETER MAURITIUS, abbot of *Clugni*; and hence it occaſioned a controverſy in form, which ſpred from day to day its baneful influence, and excited diſturbances in ſeveral provinces of *Europe* [i]. It was, however, followed with a much more vehement and bitter conteſt concerning an exemption from the payment of tithes, granted among other privileges and immunities to the Ciſtertians, A. D. 1132, by INNOCENT II. A conſiderable part of the lands which the Ciſtertians poſſeſſed, and to which the pontif granted this exemption, were ſubject to the monks of *Clugni*, who ſuffered conſequently by this act of liberality, and diſputed the matter, not only with the Ciſtertians, but with the pope himſelf. This keen diſpute was, in ſome meaſure, terminated in the year 1155, but in what manner, or upon what conditions, is more than is come to our knowledge [k].

---

[e] Isaiah xlvii. 8.

[f] See Martene *Ampliſſima Collectio Monumentor. Veter.* tom. ix. p. 1119.

[g] See Jo. Mabillon, *Annal. Ordin. Benedict.* tom. vi. paſſim, *in vita Sti. Bernardi*, which he has prefixed to his edition of the works of that ſaint.—See alſo Angeli Manriquez, *Annales Ciſtercienſes*, tom. ii. and iii.

Lives and manners of the canons.

XVIII. The *regular canons*, who were erected into a fixed and permanent order in the preceding century, employed their time in a much more uſeful and exemplary manner than the monaſtic drones, who paſſed their days in luxury and ſloth. They kept public ſchools for the inſtruction of youth, and exerciſed a variety of eccleſiaſtical functions, which rendered them extremely uſeful to the church [l]. Hence they roſe daily in credit and reputation, received many rich and noble donations from ſeveral perſons whoſe opulence and piety rendered them able and willing to diſtinguiſh merit, and were alſo often put in poſſeſſion of the revenues of the monks, whoſe diſſolute lives occaſioned, from time to time, the ſuppreſſion of their convents. This, as might well be expected, inflamed the rage of the monaſtic orders againſt the regular canons, whom they attacked with the greateſt fury, and loaded with the bittereſt invectives. The canons, in their turn, were far from being backward in making repriſals; they exclaimed, on the contrary, againſt the monks with the utmoſt vehemence; enumerated their vices both in their diſcourſes and in their writings, and inſiſted upon their being confined to their monaſteries, ſequeſtered from human ſociety, and excluded from all eccleſiaſtical honours and functions. Hence aroſe a long and furious conteſt between the monks and canons concerning pre-eminence, in which both parties carried their pretenſions too high, and exceeded the bounds of decency and moderation [m]. The champions, who eſpouſed the intereſts of the monks, were the famous PETER ABELARD, HUGH of *Amiens*, RUPERT of *Duytz*; while the cauſe of the canons was defended by PHILIP HARVENGIUS, a learned abbot, and ſeveral other men of genius and abilities [n]. The effects and remains of this ancient controverſy are yet viſible in our times.

---

[h] This apology, as it is called, of St. BERNARD is well worth the attention of the curious reader, as it exhibits a true and lively picture of monaſtic opulence and luxury, and ſhews how the religious orders in general lived in this century. The famous abbot, in this performance, accuſes the monks of *Clugni* of luxury and intemperance at their table, of ſuperfluity and magnificence in their dreſs, their bed-chambers, their furniture, equipage, and buildings. He points out the pride and vanity of the abbots, who looked much liker the governors of provinces, than the ſpiritual fathers of humble and holy communities, whoſe original profeſſion it was, to be crucified and dead to the intereſts and pleaſures, the pomps and vanities of a preſent world. He declares, with a pious concern, that he knew ſeveral abbots, each of whom had more than ſixty horſes in his ſtable, and ſuch a prodigious variety of wines in his cellar, that it was ſcarcely poſſible to taſte the half of them at a ſingle entertainment. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſtique*, livr. lxxvii. tom. xiv. p. 351. edit. *Bruxelles*.

[i] See S. BERNARDINI *Apologia* in *Oper.* tom. i. p. 523—533.—The *Apology* of PETER, abbot of *Clugni*, ſurnamed the *Venerable*, which is publiſhed among his *Epiſtles*, lib. i. ep. 28. in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacenſis*, tom. i. p. 657—695.—See alſo the *Dialogus inter Cluniacenſem et Ciſtercienſem*, publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 1573—1613.—Compare with all theſe MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 80. & MANRIQUEZ, *Annal. Ciſterc.* tom. i. p. 28.

[k] See ANGELI MANRIQUEZ, *Annal. Ciſtercienſes*, tom. i. p. 232.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 212. 479. & *Præfat. ad Opera S. Bernardi*.—JO. DE LANNES, *Hiſtoire du Pontificat d'Innocent* II, p. 68—79.—JO. NIC. HERTII *Diſſ. de exemtione Ciſterc. à decimis*.

[l] See the *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 112.

New monaſtic orders.

XIX. A new ſociety of religious Benedictines aroſe about the commencement of this century, whoſe principal monaſtery was erected in a barren and ſolitary place, called *Fontevraud*, between *Angers* and *Tours*, from whence the order derived its name. ROBERT of *Arbriſelles*, its founder, who had been firſt an hermit and afterwards a monk, preſcribed to his *religious* of both ſexes, the rule of St. BENEDICT, amplified, however, by the addition of ſeveral new laws which were extremely ſingular and exceſſively ſevere. Among other ſingularities that diſtinguiſhed this inſtitution, one was, that the ſeveral monaſteries which ROBERT had built, within one and the ſame encloſure, for his monks and nuns, were all ſubjected to the authority and government of one abbeſs, in juſtification of which meaſure the example of CHRIST was alledged, who recommended St. JOHN to the Virgin MARY, and impoſed it as an order upon that beloved diſciple to be obedient to her as to his own mother [o]. This new order, like all other novelties of that kind, gained immediately a high degree of credit; the ſingularity of its diſcipline, its form, and its laws, engaged multitudes to embrace it, and thus the labours of its founder were crowned with remarkable ſucceſs. [But the aſſociation of vigorous monks and tender virgins, in the ſame community, was an imprudent meaſure, and could not but be attended with many inconveniencies. However that be, RORERT continued his pious labours, and the odour of his ſanctity perfumed all the places where he exerciſed his miniſtry.] He was, indeed, ſuſpected by ſome, of too great an intimacy with his female diſciples; and it was rumoured about, that, in order, to try his virtue by oppoſing it to the ſtrongeſt temptations, he expoſed it to an inevitable defeat by the manner in which he converſed with theſe holy virgins. It was even ſaid, that their commerce was ſoftened by ſomething more tender than divine love; againſt which charge his diſciples have uſed their moſt zealous endeavours to defend their maſter [p].

---

[m] See LAMBERTI *Epiſtola* in MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdot* tom. i. p. 329.

[n] ABAELARDI *Opera*, p. 228. *Pariſ.* 1616, in 4to.—MARTENE, *Theſaur. Anecdot* tom. v. p. 970—975. 1614. et *Ampliſſima ejuſdem Collectio*, tom. ix. p. 971, 972.—PHIL. HARVENGII *Opera*, p. 385. *Duaci* 1621, in folio.

[o] See the *Works* of ABELARD, p. 48. whoſe teſtimony, in this matter, is confirmed by the preſent ſtate and conſtitution of this famous order; though MABILLON, from an exceſſive partiality in favour of the Benedictines, has endeavoured to diminiſh its credit in his *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 423. For an account of ROBERT and his order, ſee the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. iii. *Februar.* p. 593.—DION. SAMMARTHANI *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. p. 1311.—BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article FONTEVRAUD.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 83.—The preſent ſtate of this monaſtery is deſcribed by MOLEON, in his *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 108. and by MARTENE, in his *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, part. II. p. 1.

The Order of Premontré.

XX. NORBERT, a German nobleman, who went into holy orders, and was afterwards archbiſhop of *Magdebourg*, employed his moſt zealous efforts to reſtore to its primitive ſeverity the diſcipline of the *regular canons*, which was extremely relaxed in ſome places, and almoſt totally aboliſhed in others. This eminent reformer founded, in the year 1121, the *Order of Premontré* in *Picardy*, whoſe fame ſpred throughout *Europe* with an amazing rapidity, and whoſe opulence, in a ſhort ſpace of time, became exceſſive and enormous [q], in conſequence of the high eſteem which the monks of this community had acquired by the gravity of their manners, and their aſſiduous application to the liberal arts and ſciences. But their overgrown proſperity was the ſource of their ruin, it ſoon diminiſhed their zeal for the exerciſes of devotion, extinguiſhed their thirſt after uſeful knowledge, and thus ſtep by ſtep plunged them, at length, into all ſorts of vices. The rule which they followed was that of St. AUGUSTIN, with ſome ſlight alterations and an addition of certain ſevere laws, whoſe authority, however, did not long ſurvive their auſtere founder [r].

---

[p] See the letters of GEOFFRY, abbot of *Vendôme*, and of MARBOD, biſhop of *Rennes*, in which ROBERT is accuſed of lying in the ſame bed with the nuns. *How* the grave abbot was defended againſt this accuſation by the members of his order, may be ſeen in MAINFERME's *Clypeus Naſcentis Ordinis Fontebraldenſis*, publiſhed in 8^{vo} at *Paris* in the year 1684; and alſo by another production of the ſame author, entitled, *Diſſertationes in Epiſtolam contra Robertum de Arbriſſello*, *Salmurii* 1682, in 8^{vo}. BAYLE's account of this famous abbot, in which there is ſuch an admirable mixture of wit, ſenſe, and malice, has been alſo attacked by ſeveral writers; ſee, among others, the *Diſſertation Apologetique pour le bienheureux Robert d'Arbriſſelles ſur ce qu'en a dit M. Bayle. Anvers* 1701, in 8^{vo}.—MABILLON, *Annal.* tom. v. et vi. p. 9, 10.

[(p) In the year 1177, ſome nuns of this Order were brought into *England*, at the deſire of HENRY II, who gave them the monaſtery of *Ambreſbury* in *Wiltſhire*. They had two other houſes here; the one at *Eton*, the other at *Weſtwood* in *Worceſterſhire*.]

[(q) The *religious* of this Order were at firſt ſo poor, that they had nothing they could call their own, but a ſingle aſs, which ſerved to carry the wood they cut down every morning and ſent to *Laon* in order to purchaſe bread. But in a ſhort time they received ſo many donations, and built ſo many monaſteries, that, thirty years after the foundation of this order, they had above an hundred abbies in *France* and *Germany*. In proceſs of time, the Order increaſed ſo prodigiouſly, that it had monaſteries in all parts of *Chriſtendom*, amounting to 1000 abbies, 300 provoſtſhips, a vaſt number of priories, and 500 nunneries. But this number is now greatly diminiſhed. Beſides what they loſt in proteſtant countries, of ſixty-five abbies, that they had in *Italy*, there is not one now remaining.]

[r] See HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 156.—CHRYSOST. Van der STERIE, *Vita S. Norberti Præmonſtratenſium Patriarchæ*, publiſhed in 8^{vo} at *Antwerp* in 1656.—LOUIS HUGUES, *Vie de S. Norbert*, *Luxemb.* 1704, in 4^{to}.—Add to theſe, notwithſtanding his partiality, Jo. LAU-

XXI. About

Carmelites.

XXI. About the middle of this century, a certain Calabrian, whoſe name was **Berthold**, ſet out with a few companions for mount *Carmel*, and, upon the very ſpot where the prophet **Elias** is ſaid to have diſappeared, built an humble cottage, with an adjoining chapel, in which he led a life of ſolitude, auſterity, and labour. This little colony ſubſiſted, and the places of thoſe that died were more than filled by new comers; ſo that it was, at length [*s*], erected into a monaſtic community by **Albert**, patriarch of *Jeruſalem*. This auſtere prelate drew up a rule of diſcipline for the new monks, which was afterwards confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontifs, who modified and altered it in ſeveral reſpects, and, among other corrections, mitigated its exceſſive rigour and ſeverity [*t*]. Such was the origin of the famous *Order of Carmelites*, or, as they are commonly called, of the *Order of our Lady of mount Carmel*, which was afterwards tranſplanted from *Syria* into *Europe*, and obtained the principal rank among the mendicant or begging orders. It is true, the Carmelites reject, with the higheſt indignation, an origin ſo recent and obſcure, and affirm to this very day, that the prophet **Elias** was the parent and founder of their ancient community [*u*]. Very few, however, have been engaged to adopt this fabulous and chimerical account of their eſtabliſhment, except the members of the order, and many Roman catholic writers have treated their pretenſions to ſuch a remote antiquity with the utmoſt contempt [*w*]. [And ſcarcely, indeed, can any thing be more ridiculous than the circumſtantial narrations of the occaſion, origin, founder, and revolutions of this famous order, which we find in ſeveral eccleſiaſtical authors, whoſe zeal for this fraternity has rendered them capable of adopting without reluctance, or, at leaſt, of reciting without ſhame the moſt puerile and glaring abſurdities. They tell us, that **Elias** was intro-

---

noius, *Inquiſit. in Privilegia Ordin. Præmonſtrat.* cap. i, ii. *Oper.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 448. For an account of the preſent ſtate of the *Order of Premontré*, ſee **Martene**'s *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 59.

[(*r*) The *Præmonſtratenſes*, or monks of *Premontré*, vulgarly called *White Canons*, came firſt into *England* A. D. 1146. Their firſt monaſtery, called *New-Houſe*, was built in *Lincolnſhire* by *Peter de Saulia*, and dedicated to St. *Martial*. In the reign of **Edward** I, the order in queſtion had twenty-ſeven monaſteries in *England*.]

[*s*] In the year 1205.

[*t*] I have here principally followed **Dan. Papebroch**, an accurate writer, and one who is always careful to produce ſufficient teſtimonies of the truth of his narrations, ſee the *Acta Sanctor. Antwerp. Menſe April.* tom. iii. p. 774—802. It is well known, that an accuſation was brought againſt this learned jeſuit before the tribunal of the Roman pontif by the Carmelites, on account of his having called in queſtion the dignity and high antiquity of their order. We have in **Helyot**'s *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. i. p. 282. an account of this long and tedious conteſt, which was ſo far determined, or at leaſt ſuſpended in the year 1698, by **Innocent** XII, that ſilence was impoſed upon the contending parties.

[*u*] The moſt conciſe and accurate of all the Carmelite writers, who have treated this matter, is **Thomas Aquinas**, a French monk, in his *Diſſertatio Hiſtor. Theol. in qua Patriarchatus Ordinis Carmelitarum Prophetæ Eliæ vindicatur*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Paris*, in the year 1632. The modern writers, who have maintained the cauſe of the Carmelites againſt **Papebroch**, are extremely prolix and tireſome.

[*w*] See **Harduini** *Opera Poſthum.* p. 642.—**Labat**, *Voyage en Eſpagne et Italie*, tom. iii. p. 87.—**Courayer**, *Examen des defauts Theologiques*, tom. i. p. 455.

duced into the ſtate of monachiſm by the miniſtry of angels; that his firſt diſciples were JONAH, MICAH, and alſo OBADIAH, whoſe wife, in order to get rid of an importunate croud of lovers, who fluttered about her at the court of ACHAB after the departure of her huſband, bound herſelf by a vow of chaſtity, received the veil from the hands of *father* ELIAS, and thus became the firſt abbeſs of the Carmelite order. They enter into a vaſt detail of all the circumſtances that relate to the rules of diſcipline, which were drawn up for this community, the habit which diſtinguiſhed its numbers, and the various alterations which were introduced into their rule of diſcipline in proceſs of time. They obſerve, that, among other marks, which were uſed to diſtinguiſh the Carmelites from the ſeculars, the *tonſure* was one; that this mark of diſtinction expoſed them, indeed, to the mockeries of a profane multitude; and that this furniſhes the true explication of the terms *bald head*, which the children addreſſed, by way of reproach, to ELISHAH as he was on his way to *Carmel* [x]. They tell us, moreover, that PYTHAGORAS was a member of this ancient order; that he drew all his wiſdom from mount *Carmel*, and had ſeveral converſations, with the prophet DANIEL at *Babylon*, upon the ſubject of the Trinity. Nay, they go ſtill farther into the region of fable, and aſſert, that the Virgin MARY and JESUS himſelf aſſumed the habit and profeſſion of Carmelites; and they load this fiction with a heap of abſurd circumſtances, which it is impoſſible to read without the higheſt aſtoniſhment [y].

Greek writers.

XXII. To this brief account of the religious orders, it will not be amiſs to add a liſt of the principal Greek and Latin writers that flouriſhed in this century. The moſt eminent among the Greeks were thoſe that follow:

PHILIPPUS SOLITARIUS, whoſe *Dioptra*, or controverſy between the ſoul and the body, is ſufficiently known;

EUSTRATIUS, who maintained the cauſe of the Greek church againſt the Latins with great learning and ſpirit, and who wrote commentaries on certain books of ARISTOTLE;

---

[x] See 2 KINGS ii. 23.

[y] [(For an ample account of all the abſurd inventions here hinted at, ſee a very remarkable work, entitled, ORDRES MONASTIQUES, *Hiſtoire extraite de tous les Auteurs qui ont conſervé à la Poſterité ce q'il y a de plus curieux dans chaque ordre, enrichie d'un très-grand nombre de paſſages des mêmes Auteurs; pour ſervir de demonſtration que ce qu'on y avance eſt egalement veritable et curieux.* This work, which was firſt printed at *Paris* in 1751, under the title of *Berlin*, and which was ſuppreſſed almoſt as ſoon as it appeared, is written with great wit, eloquence, and learning, and all the narrations it contains are confirmed by citations from the moſt eminent authors who have given accounts of the religious orders. The author's deſign ſeems to have been to expoſe the monks of every denomination to the laughter of his readers; and it is very remarkable, that, in the execution of this purpoſe, he has drawn his materials from the graveſt authors, and from the moſt zealous defenders of monachiſm. If he has embelliſhed his ſubject, it is by the vivacity of his manner, and the witty elegance of his ſtyle, and not by laying to the charge of the monaſtic communities any practices which their moſt ſerious hiſtorians omit or diſavow. The authors of the *Bibliotheque des Sciences et de Beaux Arts*, at the *Hague*, have given ſeveral intereſting extracts of this work in the 2, 3, 4, and 5th volumes of that Literary Journal.]

[(y) The Carmelites came into *England* in the year 1240, and erected there a vaſt number of monaſteries almoſt through the whole kingdom. See BROUGHTON's *Hiſtorical Library*, vol. i. p. 208.]

EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, who, by his *Anti-heretical Panoply*, together with his commentaries upon ſeveral parts of the ſacred writings, has acquired a place among the principal authors of this century [z];

JOHANNES ZONARAS, whoſe *Annals*, together with ſeveral other productions of his learned pen, are ſtill extant;

MICHAEL GLYCAS, who alſo applied himſelf to hiſtorical compoſition, as well as to other branches of learning [a];

CONSTANTINUS HARMENOPULUS, whoſe commentaries on the civil and canon laws are deſervedly eſteemed;

ANDRONICUS CAMATERUS, who wrote with great warmth and vehemence againſt the Latins and Armenians;

EUSTATHIUS, biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, the moſt learned of the Greeks in this century, and the celebrated commentator of the *Iliad*;

THEODORUS BALSAMON, who employed great diligence, erudition, and labour in explaining and digeſting the civil and eccleſiaſtical laws of the Greeks [b].

Latin writers.

XXIII. The moſt eminent among the Latin writers were,

BERNARD, abbot of *Clairval*, from whom the Ciſtertian monks, as has been already obſerved, derived the title of *Bernardins*; a man who was not deſtitute of genius and taſte, and whoſe judgment, in many reſpects, was juſt and penetrating, but who, on the other hand, diſcovered in his conduct many marks of ſuperſtition and weakneſs, and, what was ſtill worſe, concealed the luſt of dominion under the maſk of piety, and made no ſcruple of loading with falſe accuſations ſuch as had the misfortune to incur his diſpleaſure [c];

INNOCENT III, biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe epiſtles and other productions contribute to illuſtrate the religious ſentiments, as alſo the diſcipline and morals, that prevailed in this century [d];

ANSELM of *Laon*, a man of a ſubtile genius, and deeply verſed in logical diſquiſition;

ABELARD, the diſciple of ANSELM, and moſt famous in this century on account of the elegance of his wit, the extent of his erudition, the power of his rhetoric, and the bitterneſs of his unhappy fate [e];

---

[z] See RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſ. par* M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 318 324.

[a] Other hiſtorians place GLYCAS in the xvth century. See LAMI *Diſſertatio de Glyca*, which is prefixed to the firſt volume of his *Deliciæ virorum eruditorum*.

[b] See the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[c] The learned MABILLON has given a ſplendid edition of the works of St. BERNARD, and has not only in his Preface made many excellent obſervations upon the life and hiſtory of this famous abbot, but has alſo ſubjoined to his *Works* the accounts that have been given, by the ancient writers, of his life and actions.

[d] The Epiſtles of INNOCENT III were publiſhed at *Paris*, in two large volumes in folio, by BALUZIUS, in the year 1682.

[e] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the articles ABELARD and PARACLET.—GERVAIS, *Vie de Pierre Abeillard, Abbe de Ruys et de Heloiſe*, publiſhed at *Paris* in two volumes 8vo. in the year 1728. The works of this famous and unfortunate monk were publiſhed at *Paris* in 1616, in one volume 4°. by FRANC. AMBOISE. Another edition, much more ample, might be given, ſince there are a great number of the productions of ABELARD that have never yet ſeen the light.

GEOFFRY of *Vendôme*, whoſe *Epiſtles* and *Diſſertations* are yet extant;

RUPERT of *Duytz*, the moſt eminent, perhaps, of all the expoſitors of the holy ſcriptures, who flouriſhed among the Latins during this century, a man of a ſound judgment and an elegant taſte [*f*];

HUGH of *St. Victor*, a man, diſtinguiſhed by the fecundity of his genius, who treated in his writings of all the branches of ſacred and profane erudition, that were known in his time, and who compoſed ſeveral diſſertations that are not deſtitute of merit [*g*];

RICHARD of *St. Victor*, who was at the head of the Myſtics in this century, and whoſe treatiſe, entitled, *The Myſtical Ark*, which contains, as it were, the marrow of that kind of theology, was received with the greateſt avidity, and applauded by the fanatics of the times [*h*];

HONORIUS of *Autun* [*i*], no mean philoſopher, and tolerably verſed in theological learning;

GRATIAN, a learned monk, who reduced the canon law into a new and regular form, in his vaſt compilation of the deciſions of the ancient and modern councils, the decretals of the pontifs, the capitularies of the kings of *France*, &c.;

WILLIAM of *Rheims*, the author of ſeveral productions, every way adapted to excite pious ſentiments, and to contribute to the progreſs of practical religion;

PETER LOMBARD, who was commonly called, in *France*, *Maſter of the Sentences*, becauſe he had compoſed a work ſo entitled, which was a collection of opinions and ſentences relative to the various branches of theology, extracted from the Latin doctors, and reduced into a ſort of ſyſtem [*k*];

GILBERTUS PORRETANUS [*l*], a ſubtile dialectician, and a learned divine, who is, however, ſaid to have adopted ſeveral erroneous ſentiments concerning *The Divine Eſſence*; *The Incarnation*; and *The Trinity* [*m*];

WILLIAM of *Auxerre*, who acquired a conſiderable reputation by his *Theological Syſtem* [*n*];

PETER of *Blois* [*o*], whoſe epiſtles and other productions may yet be red with profit;

[*f*] See MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 19, 20. 42. 144. 168. 261. 282. 296. who gives an ample account of RUPERT, and of the diſputes in which he was involved.

[*g*] See *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p. 661. The works of this learned man were publiſhed at *Rouën*, in three volumes in folio, in the year 1648. See, for a farther acccount of him, DERLANGII *Diſſert. de Hugone a S. Victore*, *Helmſtadt* 1746, in 4to. and MARTENE's *Voyage Litteraire*, tom. ii. p. 91, 92.

[*h*] *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p 669.

[*i*] Such is the place to which HONORIUS is ſaid to have belonged. But LE BOEUF proves him to have been a German, in his *Diſſert. ſur l'Hiſt. Françoiſe*, tom. i. p. 254.

[*k*] *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. vii. p. 68.

[*l*] GILBERT, *De la Poireé*.

[(*m*) He held, among other things, this trifling and ſophiſtical propoſition, that *the divine eſſence and attributes are not God*; a propoſition that was every way proper to exerciſe the quibbling ſpirit of the ſcholaſtic writers.]

[*n*] LE BOEUF, *Diſſertation ſur la Somme Theologique de Guillaume d'Auxerre* in MOLAT's *Continuation des Memoires d'Hiſtoire et de Litterature*, tom. iii. part. II. p. 317.

[*o*] PETRUS, *Bleſenſis*.

JOHN of *Saliſbury*, a man of great learning and true genius, whoſe philoſophical and theological knowledge was adorned with a lively wit and a flowing eloquence, as appears in his *Metalogicus*, and his book *De nugis Curialium*;

PETRUS COMESTOR, author of *An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtament*, which was uſed in the ſchools for the inſtruction of the youth, and called probably from thence, *Hiſtoria Scholaſtica*.

A more ample account of the names and characters of the Latin writers may be found in thoſe authors, who have profeſſedly treated that branch of literature.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church in this century.

Chriſtianity corrupted more and more.

I. WHEN we conſider the multitude of cauſes which united their influence in obſcuring the luſtre of genuine Chriſtianity, and corrupting it by a profane mixture of the inventions of ſuperſtitious and deſigning men, with its pure and ſublime doctrines, it will appear ſurprizing, that the religion of JESUS was not totally extinguiſhed. All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The Roman pontifs led the way; they would not ſuffer any doctrines that had the ſmalleſt tendency to diminiſh their deſpotic authority; but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Chriſtianity in ſuch a manner, as to render them ſubſervient to the ſupport of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was ſo much the more terrible, in that ſuch as refuſed to comply with it, and to force the words of ſcripture into ſignifications totally oppoſite to the intention of its divine author, ſuch, in a word, as had the courage to place the authority of the goſpel above that of the Roman pontifs, and to conſider it as the ſupreme rule of their conduct, were anſwered with the formidable arguments of fire and ſword, and received death in the moſt cruel forms, as the fruit of their ſincerity and reſolution. The prieſts and monks contributed, in their way, to disfigure the beautiful ſimplicity of religion; and, finding it their intereſt to keep the people in the groſſeſt ignorance and darkneſs, dazzled their feeble eyes with the ludicrous pomp of a gaudy worſhip, and led them to place the whole of religion in vain ceremonies, bodily auſterities, and exerciſes, and, particularly, in a blind and ſtupid veneration for the clergy. The ſcholaſtic doctors, who conſidered the deciſions of the ancients and the precepts of the Dialecticians, as the great rule and criterion of truth, inſtead of explaining the doctrines of the goſpel, mined them by degrees, and ſunk divine truth under the ruins of a captious philoſophy; while the Myſtics, running into the oppoſite extreme, maintained, that the ſouls of the truly pious were incapable of any ſpontaneous motions, and could only be moved by a *divine impulſe*; and thus not only ſet limits to the pretenſions of reaſon, but excluded it entirely from religion and morality; nay, in ſome meaſure, denied its very exiſtence.

Superſtition reigns among the multitude.

II. The conſequences of all this were ſuperſtition and ignorance, which were ſubſtituted in the place of true religion, and reigned over the multitude with an univerſal ſway. Relics, which were for the moſt part fictitious, or at leaſt uncertain, attracted more powerfully the confidence of the people, than the merits of CHRIST, and were ſuppoſed by many to be more effectual, than the prayers offered to heaven through the mediation and interceſſion of that divine redeemer [*p*]. The opulent, whoſe circumſtances enabled them either to erect new temples, or to repair and embelliſh the old, were looked upon as the happieſt of all mortals, and were conſidered as the moſt intimate friends of the moſt high. While they, whom poverty rendered incapable of ſuch pompous acts of liberality, contributed to the multiplication of religious edifices by their bodily labours, chearfully performed the ſervices that beaſts of burden are uſually employed in, ſuch as carrying ſtones and drawing waggons, and expected to obtain eternal ſalvation by theſe voluntary and painful efforts of miſguided zeal [*q*]. The ſaints had a greater number of worſhipers, than the ſupreme Being and the Saviour of mankind; nor did theſe ſuperſtitious worſhipers trouble their heads about that knotty queſtion, which occaſioned much debate and many laborious diſquiſitions in ſucceeding times, *viz. How the inhabitants of heaven came to the knowledge of the prayers and ſupplications that were addreſſed to them from the earth?* This queſtion was prevented in this century by an opinion, which the Chriſtians had received from their Pagan anceſtors, that the inhabitants of heaven deſcended often from above, and frequented the places, in which they had formerly taken pleaſure during their reſidence upon earth [*r*]. To finiſh the horrid portrait of ſuperſtition, we ſhall only obſerve, that the ſtupid credulity of the people in this century went ſo far, that when any perſon, either through the frenzy of a diſordered imagination, or with a deſign to deceive, publiſhed the dreams or viſions, which they *fancied*, or *pretended*, they had from above, the multitude reſorted to the new oracle, and reſpected its deciſions as the commands of God, who, in this way, was pleaſed, as they imagined, to communicate counſel, inſtruction, and the knowledge of his will to men. This appears, to mention no other examples, from the extraordinary reputation, which the two famous propheteſſes, HILDEGARD abbeſs of *Bingen*, and ELIZABETH of *Schonauge*, obtained in *Germany* [*s*].

The ſcandalous traffic of indulgences begun by the biſhops.

III. This univerſal reign of ignorance and ſuperſtition was dexterouſly, yet baſely, improved by the rulers of the church to fill their coffers, and to drain the purſes of the deluded multitude. And, indeed, all the various ranks and orders of the clergy, had, each, their peculiar method of fleecing the people. The *biſhops*, when they wanted money for their private pleaſures, or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchaſing the remiſſion of the penalties impoſed upon tranſgreſſors by a ſum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purpoſes; or, in other words, they publiſhed *indulgences*, which became an inexhauſtible ſource of opulence to the epiſcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the moſt difficult ſchemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of ſacred edifices, which augmented conſiderably the external pomp and ſplendor of the church [*t*]. The *abbots* and *monks*, who were not qualified to grant *indulgences*, had recourſe to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcaſes and relics of the ſaints in ſolemn proceſſion, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace theſe ſacred and lucrative remains, at certain fixed prices. The monaſtic orders gained often as much by this raree ſhow, as the biſhops did by their indulgences [*u*].

[*p*] See GUIBERT DE NOVIGENTO, *De pignoribus* (ſo were relicks called) *ſanctorum*, in his *Works* publiſhed by DACHERIUS, p. 327. where he attacks, with judgment and dexterity, the ſuperſtition of theſe miſerable times.

[*q*] See HAYMON's Treatiſe concerning this cuſtom, publiſhed by MABILLON, at the end of the ſixth tome of his *Annal. Benedict.* See alſo theſe *Annals*, p. 392.

[*r*] As a proof that this aſſertion is not without foundation, we ſhall tranſcribe the following remarkable paſſage of the *Life of St.* ALTMAN, *biſhop of* Padua, as it ſtands in SEB. TENGNAGL's *Collect. Vet. Monumentor.* p. 41. *Vos licet, ſancti Domini, ſomno veſtro requieſcatis . . . haud tamen crediderim, ſpiritus veſtros deeſſe locis, quæ viventes tanta devotione conſtruxiſtis et dilexiſtis. Credo vos adeſſe cunctis illic degentibus, aſtare videlicet orantibus, ſuccurrere laborantibus et vota ſingulorum in conſpectu divinæ majeſtatis promovere.*

[*s*] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 431. 529. 554.

And afterwards monopolized by the Roman pontifs.

IV. When the Roman pontifs caſt an eye upon the immenſe treaſures, that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the ſale of *indulgences*, they thought proper to limit the power of the biſhops in remitting the penalties impoſed upon tranſgreſſors, and aſſumed, almoſt entirely, this profitable traffic to themſelves. In conſequence of this new meaſure, the court of *Rome* became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontifs, when either the wants of the church, the emptineſs of their coffers, or the demon of avarice prompted them to look out for new ſubſidies, publiſhed, not only an univerſal, but alſo a complete, or what they called a *plenary* remiſſion of all the *temporal* pains and penalties, which the church had annexed to certain tranſgreſſions. They went ſtill farther; and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and eccleſiaſtical laws had enacted againſt tranſgreſſors, but audaciouſly uſurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiouſly pretended to aboliſh, even the puniſhments which are reſerved in a future ſtate for the workers of iniquity; a ſtep this, which the biſhops, with all their avarice and preſumption, had never once ventured to take [*w*].

The pontifs firſt employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and ſhed abroad their *indulgences*, though with a certain degree of

---

[t] STEPHANUS *Obazinenſis* in BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. iv. p. 130.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 535, &c.

[u] We find in the records of this century innumerable examples of this method of extorting contributions from the multitude. See the *Chronicon Centulenſe* in DACHERII *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 354.—*Vita Stæ Romanæ*, ibid. p. 137.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 342. 644.—*Acta Sanctor. Menſis Maii*, tom. vii. p. 533. where we have an account of a long journey made by the relicks of *St. Marculus*.—MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 519, 520. & tom. ii. p. 732.

[w] MORINUS, *De adminiſtratione ſacramenti pœnitentiæ*, lib. x. cap. xx, xxi, xxii. p. 768.—RICH. SIMON, *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxxiii. p. 371.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Sæc.* v. *Actor. Sanctor. Benedict.* p. 54. not to ſpeak of the proteſtant writers, whom I deſignedly paſs over.

moderation, in order to encourage the European princes to form new expeditions for the conqueſt of *Paleſtine*; but in proceſs of time, the charm of indulgences was practiſed upon various occaſions of much leſs conſequence, and merely with a view to filthy lucre [x]. Their introduction, among other things, deſtroyed the credit and authority of the ancient *canonical* and *eccleſiaſtical diſcipline of penance*, and occaſioned the removal and ſuppreſſion of the *penitentials* [y], by which the reins were let looſe to every kind of vice. Such proceedings ſtood much in need of a plauſible defence, but this was impoſſible. To juſtify therefore theſe ſcandalous meaſures of the pontifs, a moſt monſtrous and abſurd doctrine was now invented, which was modified and embelliſhed by St. THOMAS in the following century, and which contained among others the following enormities: "That there actually exiſted an immenſe treaſure of *merit* compoſed of the pious deeds, and virtuous actions, which the ſaints had performed *beyond what was neceſſary* for their own ſalvation [z], and which were therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the guardian and diſpenſer of this precious treaſure was the Roman pontif; and that, of conſequence, he was empowered to *aſſign* to ſuch as he thought proper, a *portion* of this inexhauſtible ſource of *merit*, ſuitable to their reſpective *guilt*, and ſufficient to deliver them from the puniſhment due to their crimes." It is a moſt deplorable mark of the power of ſuperſtition, that a doctrine, ſo abſurd in its nature, and ſo pernicious in its effects, ſhould yet be retained and defended in the church of *Rome* [a].

The expoſitors and commentators of this century.

V. Nothing was more common in this century than expoſitors and interpreters of the ſacred writings, but nothing was ſo rare, as to find, in that claſs of authors, the qualifications that are eſſentially required in a good commentator. Few of theſe expoſitors were attentive to ſearch after the true ſignification of the words employed by the ſacred writers, or to inveſtigate the preciſe ſenſe in which they were uſed; and theſe few were deſtitute of the ſuccours which ſuch reſearches demand. The Greek and Latin commentators, blinded by their enthuſiaſtic love of antiquity, and their implicit veneration for the doctors of the early ages of the church, drew from their writings, without diſcernment or choice, a heap of paſſages, which they were pleaſed to conſider as illuſtrations of the holy ſcriptures. Such were the commentaries of EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, an eminent expoſitor among the Greeks, upon the *Pſalms*, *Goſpels*, and *Epiſtles*; though it muſt, at the ſame time, be acknowledged, that this writer follows, in ſome places, the dictates of his own judgment, and gives, upon certain occaſions, proofs of penetration and genius. Among the Latins, we might give ſeveral examples of the injudicious manner of expounding the divine word that prevailed in this century, ſuch as the *Lucubrations* of PETER LOMBARD, GILBERT DE LA POREE, and the famous ABELARD, upon the *Pſalms of* DAVID, and the *Epiſtles of St.* PAUL. Nor do thoſe commentators among the Latins, who expounded the whole of the ſacred writings, and who are placed at the head of the expoſitors of this age, ſuch as GILBERT, biſhop of *London*, ſurnamed the *Univerſal*, on account of the vaſt extent of his erudition [b], and HERVEY, a moſt ſtudious Benedictine monk [c], deſerve a higher place in our eſteem, than the authors already mentioned. The writers that merit the preference among the Latins are RUPERT of *Duytz*, and ANSELM of *Laon*; the former of whom expounded ſeveral books of ſcripture, and the latter compoſed, or rather compiled, a *gloſſary upon the ſacred writings*. As to thoſe doctors who were not carried away by an enthuſiaſtical veneration for the ancients, who had courage enough to try their own talents, and to follow the dictates of their own ſagacity, they were chargeable with defects of another kind; for, diſregarding and overlooking the beautiful ſimplicity of divine truth, they were perpetually bent on the ſearch of all ſorts of myſteries in the ſacred writings, and were conſtantly on the ſcent after ſome hidden meaning in the plaineſt expreſſions of ſcripture. The people, called *Myſtics*, excelled peculiarly in this manner of expounding and forced, by their violent explications, the word of God into a conformity with their viſionary doctrines, their enthuſiaſtic feelings, and the ſyſtem of diſcipline which they had drawn from the excurſions of their irregular fancies. Nor were the commentators, who pretended to logic and philoſophy, and who, in effect, had applied themſelves to theſe profound ſciences, free from the contagion of *myſticiſm* in their explications of ſcripture. They followed, on the contrary, the example of theſe fanatics, as may be ſeen by HUGH of ST. VICTOR'S *Allegorical Expoſition of the Old and New Teſtament*, by the *Myſtical Ark* of RICHARD of ST. VICTOR, and by the *Myſtical Commentaries* of GUIBERT, abbot of *Nogent*, on *Obadiah*, *Hoſea*, and *Amos* [d]; not to mention ſeveral other writers who ſeem to have been animated by the ſame ſpirit.

---

[x] MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 761.—FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Rom. Pontif.* tom. ii. p. 60.—THEOD. RUINARTI *Vita Urbani* II, p. 231. tom. iii. Opp. Poſthum.

[(y) The *Penitential* was a book, in which the degree and kind of penance that were annexed to each crime, were regiſtered.]

[(z) Theſe works are known by the name of *Works of Supererogation*.]

[(a) For a ſatisfactory and ample account of the enormous doctrine of indulgences, ſee a very learned and judicious work, entitled, *Lettres ſur les Jubilés*, publiſhed in the year 1751, in three volumes 8^{vo}. by the Reverend Mr. CHAIS, miniſter of the French church in the *Hague*, on occaſion of the univerſal *Jubilée* celebrated at *Rome* the preceding year, by the order of BENEDICT XIV. In the 2^{d} volume of this excellent work, which we ſhall have frequent occaſion to conſult in the courſe of this hiſtory, there is a clear account, and a ſatisfactory refutation of the doctrine in queſtion, as alſo the hiſtory of that monſtrous practice from its origin to the preſent times.]

The manner of teaching theology that now prevailed.

VI. The moſt eminent teachers of theology reſided at *Paris*, which city was, from this time forward, frequented by ſtudents of divinity from all parts of *Europe*, who reſorted thither in crouds, to receive inſtruction from theſe celebrated maſters. The French divines were divided into different ſects. The firſt of theſe ſects, who were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *The Ancient Theologiſts*, explained the doctrines of religion, in a plain and ſimple manner, by paſſages drawn from the holy ſcriptures, from the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors, and very rarely made uſe of the ſuccours of reaſon or philoſophy in their theological lectures. In this claſs we place St. BERNARD, PETER, ſurnamed the *Chanter*, WALTER of St. VICTOR, and other doctors, who declared an open and bitter war againſt the *philoſophical divines*. The doctors, which were afterwards known by the name of *Poſitivi* and *Sententiarii*, were not, in all reſpects, different from theſe now mentioned. Imitating the examples of ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, LANFRANC, HILDEBERT, and other doctors of the preceding century, they taught and confirmed their ſyſtem of theology, principally, by collecting the deciſions of the inſpired writers, and the opinions of the ancients. At the ſame time, they were far from rejecting the ſuccours of reaſon, and the diſcuſſions of philoſophy, to which they more eſpecially had recourſe, when difficulties were to be ſolved, and adverſaries to be refuted, but in the application of which all did not diſcover the ſame degree of moderation and prudence. HUGH of St. VICTOR is ſuppoſed to have been the firſt writer of this century, who taught in this manner the doctrines of Chriſtianity digeſted into a regular ſyſtem. His example, however, was followed by many; but none acquired ſuch a ſhining reputation by his labours in this branch of ſacred erudition, as PETER, biſhop of *Paris*, ſurnamed LOMBARD, from the country which gave him birth. The *Four Books of Sentences* of this eminent prelate, which appeared in the year 1172 [e], were not only received with univerſal applauſe, but acquired alſo ſuch a high degree of authority, as induced the moſt learned doctors in all places to employ their labours in illuſtrating and expounding them. Scarcely was there any divine of note that did not undertake this popular taſk except HENRY of *Gendt*, and a few others [f]; ſo that LOMBARD, who was commonly called *Maſter of the ſentences*, on account of the famous work now mentioned, became truly a claſſic author in divinity [g].

---

[b] For an account of this prelate, ſee LE BOEF *Memoires coucernant l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 486.

[c] An ample account of this learned Benedictine is to be found in GABR. LIRON *Singularites Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. iii. p. 29.—See alſo MABILLON *Annales Bened.* tom. vi. p. 477. 719.

[d] The *Prologus in Abdiam* has been publiſhed by MABILLON, in his *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 637.

The ſcholaſtics, properly ſo called.

VII. The followers of LOMBARD, who were called *Sententiarii*, though their manner of teaching was defective in ſome reſpects, and not altogether exempt from vain and trivial queſtions, were always attentive to avoid entering too far into the ſubtilties of the Dialecticians, nor did they preſumptuouſly attempt ſubmitting the divine truths of the goſpel to the uncertain and obſcure principles of a refined and intricate logic, which was rather founded on the excurſions of fancy, than on the nature of things. They had, for contemporaries, another ſet of theologiſts, who were far from imitating their moderation and prudence in this reſpect; a ſet of ſubtile doctors who taught the plain and ſimple truths of Chriſtianity in the obſcure terms and with the perplexing diſtinctions uſed by the Dialecticians, and explained, or rather darkened, with their unintelligible jargon, the ſublime precepts of the wiſdom that is from above. This method of teaching theology, which was afterwards called the *ſcholaſtic* ſyſtem, becauſe it was in general uſe in the ſchools, had for its author PETER ABELARD, a man of the moſt ſubtile genius, whoſe public lectures in philoſophy and divinity had raiſed him to the higheſt ſummit of literary renown, and who was ſucceſſively canon of *Paris*, and monk and abbot of *Ruys* [*h*]. The fame he acquired by this new method, engaged many ambitious divines to adopt it; and, in a ſhort ſpace of time, the followers of ABELARD multiplied prodigiouſly not only in *France*, but alſo in *England* and *Italy*. Thus was the *pure* and *peaceable* wiſdom of the goſpel perverted into a ſcience of mere ſophiſtry and chicane; for theſe ſubtile doctors never explained or illuſtrated any ſubject, but, on the contrary, darkened and disfigured the plaineſt expreſſions, and the moſt evident truths by their laboured and uſeleſs diſtinctions, fatigued both themſelves and others with unintelligible ſolutions of abſtruſe and frivolous queſtions, and, through a rage for diſputing, maintained with equal vehemence and ardor the oppoſite ſides of the moſt ſerious and momentous queſtions [*i*].

---

[e] ERPOLDI LINDENBROGII *Scriptores Septemtrionales*, p. 250.

[f] A liſt of the commentators who laboured in explaining the *Sentences* of PETER LOMBARD, is given by ANTON. POSSEVINUS, in his *Biblioth. Selecta*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 242.

[(g) The *Book of Sentences*, which rendered the name of PETER LOMBARD ſo illuſtrious, was a compilation of ſentences and paſſages drawn from the fathers, whoſe manifold contradictions this eminent prelate endeavoured to reconcile. His work may be conſidered as a complete body of divinity. It conſiſts of FOUR BOOKS, each of which is ſubdivided into various chapters and ſections. In the FIRST he treats of the *Trinity*, and the *Divine Attributes*; in the SECOND, of the *Creation* in general, of the *Origin of Angels*, the *Formation and Fall of Man*, of *Grace* and *Free Will*, of *Original Sin* and *Actual Tranſgreſſion*; in the THIRD, of the *Incarnation*, and *Perfections of Jeſus Chriſt*, of *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, of the *Gifts of the Spirit*, and the *Commandments of God*. The *Sacraments*, the *Reſurrection*, the *Laſt Judgment*, and the *State of Righteous in Heaven*, are the ſubjects treated in the FOURTH and laſt book of this famous work, which was the wonder of the twelfth century, and is little more than an object of contempt in ours.]

The Chriſtian doctors divided into two claſſes, called *biblici* and *ſcholaſtici*.

VIII. From this period, therefore, an important diſtinction was made between the Chriſtian doctors, who were divided into two claſſes. In the firſt claſs were placed thoſe, who were called by the various names of *biblici*, *i. e.* bible-doctors, *dogmatici* and *poſitivi*, *i. e.* didactic divines, and alſo *veteres* or ancients; and in the ſecond were ranged the *ſcholaſtics*, who were alſo diſtinguiſhed by the titles of *Sententiarii*, after the *Maſter of the ſentences*, and *Novi*, to expreſs their recent origin. The *former* expounded, though in a wretched manner, the ſacred writings in their public ſchools, illuſtrated the doctrines of Chriſtianity without deriving any ſuccours from reaſon or philoſophy, and confirmed their opinions by the united teſtimonies of *Scripture* and *Tradition*. The *latter* expounded, inſtead of the Bible, the famous *Book of Sentences*, reduced, under the province of their ſubtile philoſophy, whatever the goſpel propoſed as an object of faith, or a rule of practice, and perplexed and obſcured its divine doctrines and precepts by a multitude of vain queſtions, and idle ſpeculations [*k*]. The method of the *ſcholaſtics* exhibited a pompous aſpect of learning, and theſe ſubtile doctors ſeemed to ſurpaſs their adverſaries in ſagacity and genius; hence they excited the admiration of the ſtudious youth, who flocked to their ſchools in multitudes, while the *biblici*, or *doctors of the ſacred page*, as they were alſo called, had the mortification to ſee their auditories unfrequented, and almoſt totally deſerted [*l*]. The ſcholaſtic theology continued in high repute in all the European colleges until the time of LUTHER.

[*h*] ABELARD acknowledges this himſelf, *Epiſt.* i. *cap.* ix. p. 20. *Oper.*—See alſo LAUNOIUS, *De Scholis Caroli M.* p. 67. cap. lix. tom. iv. Opp. part. I.

[*i*] CÆS. EGASSE DE BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 201. 583.—ANTON. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 58.—LAUNOIUS, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna in Acad. Pariſ* cap. iii. p. 187. *Edit. Elſwichii Vitemb.* 1720. in 8^{ve}.

[*k*] See BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 657.

The ſcholaſtic divines oppoſed from different quarters.

IX. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that theſe metaphyſical divines had many difficulties to encounter, and much oppoſition to overcome, before they could obtain that boundleſs authority in the European ſchools which they enjoyed ſo long. They were attacked from different quarters; on the one hand, by the *ancient divines*, or bible-doctors; on the other, by the *myſtics*, who conſidered true wiſdom and knowledge as unattainable by ſtudy or reaſoning, and as the fruit of mere contemplation, inward feeling, and a paſſive acquieſcence in divine influences. Thus that ancient conflict between *faith* and *reaſon*, that had formerly divided the Latin doctors, and had been for many years huſhed in ſilence, was now unhappily revived, and produced every where new tumults and diſſenſions. The patrons and defenders of the ancient theology, who attacked the ſchoolmen, were GUIBERT abbot of *Nogent* [*m*], PETER abbot of *Mouſtier-la-Celle* [*n*], PETER the Chanter [*o*], and principally WALTER of St. VICTOR [*p*]. The myſtics alſo ſent forth into the field of controverſy upon this occaſion their ableſt and moſt violent champions, ſuch as JOACHIM, abbot of *Flori*, RICHARD of St. VICTOR, who loaded with invectives the ſcholaſtic divines and more eſpecially LOMBARD, though he was, undoubtedly, the moſt candid and modeſt doctor of that ſubtile tribe. Theſe diſſenſions and conteſts, whoſe deplorable effects augmented from day to day, engaged ALEXANDER III, who was pontif at this time, to interpoſe his authority in order to reſtore tranquillity and concord in the church. For this purpoſe he convoked a ſolemn and numerous aſſembly of the clergy in the year 1164 [q], in which the licentious rage of diſputing about religious matters was condemned, and another in the year 1179, in which ſome particular errors of Peter Lombard were pointed out and cenſured [r].

[*l*] The *Book of Sentences* ſeemed to be at this time in much greater repute, than the holy ſcriptures, and the compilations of PETER LOMBARD were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of JESUS CHRIST. This appears evident from the following remarkable paſſage in ROGER BACON's *Op. Maj. ad Clementem* IV, *Pontif. Rom.* publiſhed in 1733 at *London*, by SAM. JEBB, from the original MSS. *Baccalaureus qui legit textum* (ſcripturæ) *ſuccumbit lectori ſententiarum et ubique in omnibus honoratur et præfertur: nam ille, qui legit ſententias, habet principalem horam legendi ſecundum ſuam voluntatem, habet et ſocium et cameram apud religioſos: ſed qui legit Bibliam, caret his, et mendicat horam legendi ſecundum quod placet lectori ſententiarum: et qui legit ſummas, diſputat ubique et pro magiſtro habetur, reliquus qui textum legit, non poteſt diſputare, ſicut fuit hoc anno Bononiæ, et in multis aliis locis, quod eſt abſurdum: manifeſtum eſt igitur, quod textus illius facultatis* (ſc. Theologicæ) *ſubjicitur uni ſummæ magiſtrali.* Such was now the authority of the ſcholaſtic theology, as appears from the words of BACON, who lived in the following age, and in whoſe writings there are many things highly worthy of the attention of the curious.

[*m*] In his *Tropologiæ in Oſeam*, p. 203. Opp.

[*n*] *Opuſcul.* p. 277. 396. edit. *Benedict.*

[*o*] In his *Verbum Abbreviat.* cap. iii. p. 6, 7. publiſhed at *Mons* in the year 1639, in 4$^{to.}$ by GEORGE GALOPIN.

[*p*] In his *Libri* iv. *contra Quatuor Franciæ Labyrinthos et novos hæreticos.* He called *Abelard*, *Gilbert de la Porreé*, *Lombard*, and *Peter of Poitiers*, who were the principal ſcholaſtic divines of this century, the four *Labyrinths* of *France*. For an account of this work, which is yet in manuſcript, ſee BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 619. 659.

And principally by St. Bernard.

X. But of all the adverſaries that aſſailed the ſcholaſtic divines in this century, none was ſo formidable as the famous St. Bernard, whoſe zeal was ardent beyond all expreſſion, and whoſe influence and authority were equal to his zeal. And, accordingly, we find this illuſtrious abbot combating the Dialecticians, not only in his writings and his converſation, but alſo by his deeds; arming againſt them ſynods and councils, the decrees of the church, and the laws of the ſtate. The renowned Abelard, who was as much ſuperior to St. Bernard in ſagacity and erudition, as he was his inferior in credit and authority, was one of the firſt, who felt, by a bitter experience, the averſion of the lordly abbot to the ſcholaſtic doctors. For in the year 1121, he was called before the council of *Soiſſons*, and before that of *Sens* in the year 1140, in both of which aſſemblies he was accuſed by St. Bernard of the moſt pernicious errors, and was finally condemned, as an egregious heretic [s]. The charge brought againſt this ſubtile and learned monk was, that he had notoriouſly corrupted the doctrine of the Trinity, blaſphemed againſt the majeſty of the Holy Ghoſt, entertained unworthy and falſe conceptions of the perſon and offices of Christ, and the union of the two natures in him, denied the neceſſity of the divine grace to render us virtuous, and, in a word, that his doctrines ſtruck at the fundamental principles of all religion. It muſt be confeſſed by thoſe, who are acquainted with the writings of Abelard, that he expreſſed himſelf in a very ſingular and incongruous manner upon ſeveral points of theology [t]; and this indeed is one of the inconveniences to which ſubtile refinements upon myſterious doctrines frequently lead. But it is certain, on the other hand, that St. Bernard, who had much more genius than logic, miſunderſtood ſome of the opinions of Abelard, and wilfully perverted others. For the zeal of this good abbot too rarely permitted him to conſult in his deciſions the dictates of impartial equity; and hence it was, that he almoſt always applauded beyond meaſure, and cenſured without mercy [u].

---

[q] Ant. Pagi *Critic. in Baronium*, tom. iv. *ad A.* 1164. p 614, 615.

[r] Matth. Paris, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 115.—Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 402.

[s] See Bayle's *Dictionary*, at the article Abelard.—Gervais, *Vie d'Abelard et d'Heloiſe* — Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 63. 84. 324. 395.—Martene, *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1139.

[(t) He affirmed, for example, among other things equally unintelligible and extravagant, that the names *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, were improper terms, and were only uſed to expreſs the *fullneſs of the ſovereign good*; that the *Father* was the *plenitude of power*, the *Son* a *certain power*, and the *Holy Ghoſt* no *power* at all; that the *Holy Ghoſt* was the *ſoul of the world*, with other crude fancies of a like nature, mingled, however, with bold truths.]

[u] See Gervais, *Vie d'Abelard*, tom. ii. p. 162.—Le Clerc, *Biblioth. Ancienne et Moderne*, tom. ix. p. 352.—Dionys. Petav. *Dogmata Theolog.* tom. i. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 217. as alſo the works of Bernard, *paſſim*. Abelard, who, notwithſtanding all his crude notions, was a man of true genius, was, undoubtedly, worthy of a better fate, than that which fell to his lot, and of a more enlightened age, than that in which he lived. After paſſing through the furnace of perſecution,

XI. ABELARD was not the only ſcholaſtic divine, who paid dear for his metaphyſical refinement upon the doctrines of the goſpel, and whoſe logic expoſed him to the unrelenting fury of perſecution, GILBERT DE LA PORRE, biſhop of *Poitiers*, who had taught theology and philoſophy at *Paris*, and in other places with the higheſt applauſe, met with the ſame fate. Unfortunately for him, ARNOLD and CALO, two of his archdeacons, who had been educated in the principles of the ancient theology, heard him one day diſputing, with more ſubtilty than was meet, concerning the divine nature. Alarmed at the novelty of his doctrine, they brought a charge of blaſphemy againſt him before pope EUGENIUS III, who was, at that time, in *France*; and to give weight to their accuſation, they gained over St. BERNARD, and engaged him in their cauſe. This zealous abbot treated the matter with his uſual vehemence, and oppoſed GILBERT with the utmoſt ſeverity and bitterneſs, firſt in the council of *Paris* A. D. 1147, and afterwards in that which was aſſembled at *Rheims* the year following. In this latter council the accuſed biſhop, in order to put an end to the diſpute, offered to ſubmit his opinions to the judgment of the aſſembly, and of the Roman pontif, by whom they were condemned. The errors attributed to GILBERT were the fruits of an exceſſive ſubtilty, and of an extravagant paſſion for reducing the doctrines of Chriſtianity under the empire of metaphyſic and dialectic. He diſtinguiſhed the divine *eſſence* from the *Deity*, the *properties* of the three divine perſons from the *perſons* themſelves, not in reality, but, by abſtraction, in *ſtatu rationis*, as the metaphyſicians ſpeak; and, in conſequence of theſe diſtinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature. To theſe he added other opinions, derived from the ſame ſource, which were rather vain, fanciful, and adapted to excite ſurprize by their novelty, than glaringly falſe, or really pernicious. Theſe refined notions were far above the comprehenſion of good St. BERNARD, who was, by no means, accuſtomed to ſuch profound diſquiſitions, to ſuch intricate reſearches [w].

The ſtate of moral and practical theology.

XII. The important ſcience of morals was not now in a very flouriſhing ſtate, as may be eaſily imagined when we conſider the genius and ſpirit of that philoſophy, which, in this century, reduced all the other ſciences under its dominion, and of which we have given ſome account in the preceding ſections. The only moral writer among the Greeks, who is worthy of mention, is PHILIP, ſurnamed the *Solitary*, whoſe book entitled *Dioptra*, which conſiſts in a dialogue between the body and the ſoul, is compoſed with judgment and elegance, and contains many things proper to nouriſh pious and virtuous ſentiments.

The Latin Moraliſts of this age may be divided into two claſſes, the *ſcholaſtics*, and *myſtics*. The former diſcourſed about virtue, as they did

---

and having ſuffered afflictions of various kinds, of which he has tranſmitted the hiſtory to poſterity, he retired to the monaſtery of *Clugni*, where he ended his days in the year 1142.

[w] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 223. 232.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 343. 415. 433.—*Gallia Chriſtiana Benedictin.* tom. ii. p. 1175.—MATTH. PARIS *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 56.—PETAVII *Dogmata Theologica*, tom. i. lib. i. cap. viii.—LONGUEVAL *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. ix. p. 147.

about truth, in the moſt unfeeling, unaffecting jargon, and generally ſubjoined their arid ſyſtem of morals to what they called their *didactic theology*. The latter treated the duties of morality in a quite different manner; their language was tender, perſuaſive, and affecting, and their ſentiments often beautiful and ſublime; but they taught in a confuſed and irregular manner, without method, or preciſion, and frequently mixed the droſs of Platoniſm with the pure treaſures of celeſtial truth.

We might alſo place in the claſs of moral writers the greateſt part of the commentators and expoſitors of this century, who, laying aſide all attention to the ſignification of the words uſed by the ſacred writers, and ſcarcely ever attempting to illuſtrate the truths they reveal, or the events which they relate, turned, by forced and allegorical explications, every paſſage of ſcripture to practical uſes, and drew leſſons of morality from every quarter. We could produce many inſtances of this way of commenting beſides GUIBERT'S *Moralia in Jobum*, *Amos et Lamentationes Jeremiæ*.

Polemic writers.

XIII. Both Greeks and Latins were ſeized with that enthuſiaſtic paſſion for dialectical reſearches, that raged in this century, and were thereby rendered extremely fond of captious queſtions and theological conteſts, while, at the ſame time, the love of controverſy ſeduced them from the paths that lead to truth, and involved them in labyrinths of uncertainty and error. The diſcovery of truth was not, indeed, the great object they had in view; their principal deſign was to puzzle and embarraſs their adverſaries, and overwhelm them with an enormous heap of fine-ſpun diſtinctions, an impetuous torrent of words without meaning, a long liſt of formidable authorities, and a ſpecious train of fallacious conſequences embelliſhed with railings and invectives. The principal polemic writers among the Greeks were CONSTANTINUS HARMENOPULUS, and EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS. The former, publiſhed a ſhort treatiſe *De Sectis Hæreticorum*, *i. e.* concerning the *Heretical Sects*. The latter in a long and laboured work, entitled *Panoplia*, attacked all the various hereſies and errors that troubled the church; but, not to mention the extreme levity and credulity of this writer, his manner of diſputing was highly defective, and all his arguments, according to the wretched method that now prevailed, were drawn from the writings of the ancient doctors, whoſe authority ſupplied the place of evidence. Both theſe authors were ſharply cenſured in a ſatirical poem compoſed by ZONARAS. The Latin writers were alſo employed in various branches of religious controverſy. HONORIUS of *Autun* wrote againſt certain hereſies; and ABELARD combated them all. The Jews, whoſe credit was now entirely ſunk, and whoſe circumſtances were miſerable in every reſpect, were refuted by GILBERT *de Caſtilione*, ODO, PETRUS ALFONSUS, RUPERT of *Duitz*, PETRUS MAURITIUS, RICHARDUS *à Sto. Victore*, and PETRUS BLESENSIS, according to the logic of the times, and EUTHYMIUS, with ſeveral other divines, directed their polemic force againſt the Saracens.

The conteſt between the Greeks and Latins continued.

XIV. The conteſt between the Greeks and Latins, the ſubject of which has been already mentioned, was ſtill carried on by both parties with the greateſt obſtinacy and vehemence. The Grecian champions were EUTHY-

MIUS, NICETAS, and others of leſs renown, while the cauſe of the Latins was vigorouſly maintained by ANSELM, biſhop of *Havelſberg*, and HUGO ETHERIANUS, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves eminently by their erudition in this famous controverſy [x]. Many attempts were made, both at *Rome* and at *Conſtantinople*, to reconcile theſe differences, and to heal theſe fatal diviſions; and this union was ſollicited, in a particular manner, by the emperors in the Comnene family, who expected to draw much advantage from the friendſhip and alliance of the Latins, towards the ſupport of the Grecian empire, which was at this time in a declining, nay, almoſt in a deſperate condition. But as the Latins aimed at nothing leſs than a deſpotic ſupremacy over the Greek church, and as, on the other hand, the Grecian biſhops could, by no means, be induced to yield an implicit obedience to the Roman pontif, or to condemn the meaſures and proceedings of their anceſtors, the negociations, undertaken for the reſtoration of peace, widened the breach inſtead of healing it, and the terms propoſed on both ſides, but eſpecially by the Latins, exaſperated, inſtead of calming, the reſentments, and animoſities of the contending parties.

Matters of leſs moment controverted among the Greeks.

XV. Many controverſies of inferior moment were carried on among the Greeks, who were extremely fond of diſputing, and were ſcarcely ever without debates upon religious matters. We ſhall not enter into a circumſtantial narration of theſe theological conteſts, which are more proper to fatigue than to amuſe or inſtruct, but ſhall confine ourſelves to a brief mention of thoſe which made the greateſt noiſe in the empire. Under the reign of EMANUEL COMNENUS, whoſe extenſive learning was accompanied with an exceſſive curioſity, ſeveral theological controverſies were carried on, in which he himſelf bore a principal part, and which fomented ſuch diſcords, and animoſities among a people already exhauſted and dejected by inteſtine tumults, as threatned their deſtruction. The firſt queſtion that exerciſed the metaphyſical talent of this over curious emperor and his ſubtile doctors was this: *In what ſenſe it was or might be affirmed, that an incarnate God was at the ſame time the* OFFERER *and the* OBLATION? When this knotty queſtion had been long debated, and the emperor had maintained, for a conſiderable time, the ſolution of it that was contrary to the opinion generally received, he yielded at length, and embraced the popular notion of that unintelligible ſubject. The conſequence of this ſtep was, that many men of eminent abilities and great credit, who had differed from the doctrine of the church upon this article, were deprived of their honours and employments [y]. What the emperor's opinion of this matter was, we find no where related in a ſatisfactory manner, and we are equally ignorant of the ſentiments adopted by the church in relation to this queſtion. It is highly probable that the emperor, followed by certain learned doctors, differed from the opinions generally received among the Greeks concerning the Lord's ſupper, and the *oblation* or ſacrifice of CHRIST in that holy ordinance.

---

[x] See LEO ALLATIUS *De perpetua conſenſione Eccleſiæ Oriental. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 644.

[y] NICETAS CHONIATES, *Annal. Lib.* vii. § 5. p. 112. ed. *Venetæ*.

XVI. Some

The Greeks diſpute concerning the words of Chriſt, *John* xiv. 28.

XVI Some years after this a ſtill more warm conteſt aroſe concerning the ſenſe of thoſe words of CHRIST, *John*, XIV. 28. *For my Father is greater than I*, and divided the Greeks into the moſt bitter and deplorable factions. To the ancient explications of that important paſſage new illuſtrations were now added, and the emperor himſelf, who, from an indifferent prince, was become a wretched divine, publiſhed an expoſition of that remarkable text, which he obtruded, as the only true ſenſe of the words, upon a council aſſembled for that purpoſe, and was deſirous of having received as a rule of faith by all the Grecian clergy. He maintained, that the words in queſtion related to the *fleſh that was hid in Chriſt, and that was paſſible, i. e.* ſubject to ſuffering [z], and not only ordered this deciſion to be engraven on tables of ſtone in the principal church of *Conſtantinople*, but alſo publiſhed an edict in which capital puniſhments were denounced againſt all ſuch, as ſhould preſume to oppoſe this explication, or teach any doctrine repugnant to it [*a*]. This edict, however, expired with the emperor by whom it was iſſued out, and ANDRONICUS, upon his acceſſion to the imperial throne, prohibited all thoſe conteſts concerning ſpeculative points of theology, that aroſe from an irregular and wanton curioſity, and ſuppreſſed, in a more particular manner, all inquiry into the ſubject now mentioned, by enacting the ſevereſt penalties againſt ſuch as ſhould in any way contribute to revive this diſpute [*b*].

Concerning the God of Mahomet.

XVII. The ſame theological emperor troubled the church with another controverſy concerning the God of MAHOMET. The Greek Catechiſms pronounced *anathema* againſt the Deity worſhiped by that falſe prophet, whom they repreſented as a *ſolid* and *ſpherical Being* [*c*]; for ſo they tranſlated the Arabian word *elſemed*, which is applied in the *koran* to the ſupreme Being, and which indeed is ſuſceptible of that ſenſe, though it alſo ſignifies *eternal* [*d*]. The emperor ordered this *anathema* to be effaced in the Catechiſm of the Greek church, on account of the high offence it gave to the Mahometans, who had either been already converted to Chriſtianity, or were diſpoſed to embrace that divine religion, and who were extremely ſhocked at ſuch an inſult offered to the name of God, with whatever reſtrictions and conditions it might be attended. The Chriſtian doctors, on the other hand, oppoſed with much reſolution and vehemence this imperial order. They obſerved that the *anathema*, pronounced in the Cathechiſm, had no relation to the nature of God in general, nor to the true God in particular, and that, on the contrary, it was ſolely directed againſt the error of MAHOMET, againſt that phantom of a divinity which he had imagined. For that impoſtor pretended that the Deity could neither be *engendred* nor *engender*; whereas the Chriſtians adore God the *Father*. After the bittereſt diſputes, concerning this abſtruſe ſubject, and various efforts to reconcile the contending parties, the biſhops, aſſembled in council, conſented, though with the utmoſt difficulty, to tranſfer the *imprecation* of the Catechiſm from the God of MAHOMET, to MAHOMET himſelf, his doctrine, and his ſect [e].

---

[z] Κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ κτιστὴν ϗ παθητὴν σάρκα.

[*a*] NICETAS CHONIATES *Annal.* lib. vii. § 6. p. 113.

[*b*] NICETAS *in Andronico*, lib. ii. § 5. p. 175.

[*c*] Ὁλόσφυρος.

[*d*] RELAND. *De Religione Mohammedica*, lib. ii. § 3. p. 142.

The controverſy concerning the Lord's ſupper is carried on among the Latins.

XVIII. The ſpirit of controverſy raged among the Latins, as well as among the Greeks, and various ſentiments concerning the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper were propagated, not only in the ſchools, but alſo in the writings of the learned. For though all the doctors of the church were now extremely deſirous of being looked upon as enemies to the ſyſtem of BERENGER, yet many of them, and, among others [f], RUPERT of *Duytz*, differed very little from the ſentiments of that great man; at leaſt, it is certain, that notwithſtanding the famous controverſy which had ariſen in the church concerning the opinions of BERENGER, nothing was, as yet, preciſely determined with reſpect to the manner of CHRIST's preſence in the euchariſt.

RUPERT had alſo religious conteſts of another nature with ANSELM, biſhop of *Laon*, WILLIAM of *Champeaux*, and their diſciples and followers, who maintained their doctrine, when they were no more. The *divine will* and the *divine omnipotence* were the ſubjects of this controverſy, and the queſtion debated was, “Whether God *really willed*, and *actually produced* all things “that exiſt, or whether there are certain things whoſe exiſtence he *merely* “*permits*, and whoſe production inſtead of being the *effect of his will*, was “contrary to it?” The affirmative of the latter part of this queſtion was maintained by RUPERT, while his adverſaries held that all things were the effects not only of the *divine power*, but alſo of the *divine will*. This learned abbot was alſo accuſed of having taught that the *angels were formed out of darkneſs*; that CHRIST *did not adminiſter his body to* JUDAS *in the laſt ſupper*; and ſeveral other doctrines [g], contrary to the received opinions of the church.

As alſo that concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.

XIX. Theſe and other controverſies of a more private kind, which made little noiſe in the world, were ſucceeded, about the year 1140, by one of a more public nature concerning, what was called, the *Immaculate conception of the Virgin* MARY [h]. Certain churches in *France* began, about that time, to celebrate the feſtival conſecrated to this pretended *conception*, which the Engliſh had obſerved before this period in conſequence of the exhortations of ANSELM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, as ſome authors report. The church of *Lions* was one of the firſt that adopted this new feſtival, which no ſooner came to the knowledge of St. BERNARD, than he ſeverely cenſured the Canons of *Lions* on account of this innovation, and oppoſed the *Immaculate conception of the Virgin* with the greateſt vigour, as it ſuppoſed her being honoured with a privilege, which belonged to CHRIST alone. Upon this a warm conteſt aroſe; ſome ſiding with the Canons of *Lions*, and adopting the new feſtival, while others adhered to the ſentiments of St. BERNARD [i]. The controverſy, however, notwithſtanding the zeal of the contending parties, was carried on, during this century, with a certain degree of decency and moderation. But in after times, when the Dominicans were eſtabliſhed in the academy of *Paris*, the conteſt was renewed with the greateſt vehemence, and the ſame ſubject was debated, on both ſides, with the utmoſt animoſity and contention of mind. The Dominicans declared for St. BERNARD, while the academy patronized the canons of *Lions*, and adopted the new feſtival.

---

[e] NICETÆ CHON. *Annales*, lib. vii. p. 113—116.

[f] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 30.

[g] See MENGOZ. *Epiſtola*, publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 290. —JO. MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 19, 20. 42. 168. 261.

[(h) The defenders of this *Immaculate Conception* maintained, that the Virgin MARY was *conceived* in the womb of her mother with the ſame *purity* that is attributed to CHRIST's conception in her womb.]

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Rites uſed in the Greek church.

I. THE rites and ceremonies uſed in divine worſhip, both public and private, were now greatly augmented among the Greeks, and the ſame ſuperſtitious paſſion for the introduction of new obſervances, diſcovered itſelf in all the eaſtern churches. The Grecian, Neſtorian, and Jacobite pontifs, that were any way remarkable for their credit or ambition, were deſirous of tranſmitting their names to poſterity by the invention of ſome new rite, or by ſome ſtriking change introduced into the method of worſhip that had hitherto prevailed. This was, indeed, almoſt the only way left to diſtinguiſh themſelves in an age, where all ſenſe of the excellence of genuine religion and ſubſtantial piety being almoſt totally loſt, the whole care and attention of an oſtentatious clergy, and a ſuperſtitious multitude were employed upon that round of external ceremonies and obſervances that were ſubſtituted in their place. Thus ſome attempted, though in vain, to render their names immortal by introducing a new method of reading or reciting the prayers of the church; others changed the church muſic; others, again, tortured their inventions to find out ſome new mark of veneration, that might be offered to the relics and images of the ſaints; while ſeveral eccleſiaſtics did not diſdain to employ their time, with the moſt ſerious aſſiduity, in embelliſhing the garments of the clergy, and in forming the motions and poſtures, they were to obſerve, and the looks they were to aſſume in the celebration of divine worſhip.

The Latin rituals.

II. We may learn from the book *De divinis officiis*, compoſed by the famous RUPERT, or ROBERT, of *Duytz*, what were the rites in uſe among the Latins during this century, as alſo the reaſons on which they were founded. According to the plan we follow, we cannot here enlarge upon the additions that were made to the doctrinal part of religion. We ſhall therefore only obſerve, that the enthuſiaſtic veneration for the Virgin MARY, which had been hitherto carried to ſuch an exceſſive height, increaſed now inſtead of diminiſhing, ſince her dignity was at this time conſiderably augmented by the new fiction or invention relating to her *immaculate conception*. For though, as we obſerved in the preceding chapter, St. BERNARD and others oppoſed with vigour this chimerical notion, yet their efforts were counteracted by the ſuperſtitious fury of the deluded multitude, whoſe judgment prevailed over the counſels of the wiſe. So that about the year 1138, there was a ſolemn feſtival inſtituted in honour of this pretended *conception*, though we know not, with any degree of certainty, by whoſe authority it was firſt eſtabliſhed, nor in what place it was firſt celebrated [*k*].

---

[i] STI. BERNARDI *Epiſtola* 174. tom. i. p. 170.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 135.—MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 327.—DOM. COLONIA, *Hiſt. Litt. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 233.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Fanatics of different kinds infeſt the Greek church.

I. THE Greek and eaſtern churches were infeſted with fanatics of different kinds, who gave them much trouble, and engaged them in the moſt warm and violent conteſts. Certain of theſe fanatics profeſſed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abſtained from fleſh, treated, with the utmoſt contempt, the ſacraments of baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, as alſo all the various branches of external worſhip, placed the eſſence of religion in internal prayer alone, and maintained, as it is ſaid, that an evil being, or genius, dwelt in the breaſt of every mortal, and could be expelled from thence by no other method, than by perpetual ſupplications to the ſupreme Being. The founder of this enthuſiaſtical ſect is ſaid to have been a perſon called LUCOPETRUS. His chief diſciple was named TYCHICUS, who corrupted, by falſe and fanatical interpretations, ſeveral books of the ſacred writings, and particularly the *Goſpel according to St. Matthew* [*l*]. It is well known, that enthuſiaſts of this kind, who were rather wrong-headed than vicious, lived among the Greeks and Syrians, and more eſpecially among the monks, for many ages before this period, and alſo in this century. The accounts, indeed, that have been given of them, are not in all reſpects to be depended upon; and there are ſeveral circumſtances which render it extremely probable, that many perſons of eminent piety, and zeal for genuine Chriſtianity, were confounded by the Greeks among theſe enthuſiaſts, and ranked in the liſt of heretics, merely on account of their oppoſing the vicious practices, and the inſolent tyranny of the prieſthood, and their treating with deriſion that motley ſpectacle of ſuperſtition that was ſupported by public authority In *Greece*, and in all the eaſtern provinces, this ſort of men were diſtinguiſhed by the general and invidious appellation of *Maſſalians*, or *Euchites* [*m*], as the Latins comprehended all the adverſaries of the Roman

---

[*k*] MABILLON, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 327. 412.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 1198.

[*l*] See EUTHYMII *Triumphus de Secta Maſſalianorum* in JAC. TOLLII *Inſignibus Itineris Italici*, p. 106—125.

[(*m*) *Maſſalians* and *Euchites* are denominations that ſignify the ſame thing, and denote, the one in the Hebrew, and the other in the Greek language, *perſons that pray*. A ſect, under this denomination, aroſe during the reign of the emperor CONSTANTIUS, about the year 361, founded by pontif under the general terms of *Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve, that the names abovementioned were very vague and ambiguous in the way they were applied by the Greeks and the Orientals, who made uſe of them to characterize, without diſtinction, all ſuch as complained of the multitude of uſeleſs ceremonies, and of the vices of the clergy, without any regard to the difference, that there was between ſuch perſons in point of principles and morals. In ſhort, the righteous and the profligate, the wiſe and the fooliſh, were equally comprehended under the name of Maſſalians, whenever they oppoſed the raging ſuperſtition of the times, or looked upon true and genuine piety as the eſſence of the Chriſtian character.

The Bogomiles.

II. From the ſect now mentioned, that of the *Bogomiles* is ſaid to have proceeded, whoſe founder BASILIUS, a monk by profeſſion, was burnt at *Conſtantinople*, under the reign of ALEXIUS COMNENUS, after all attempts to make him renounce his errors had proved ineffectual. By the accounts we have of this unhappy man, and of the errors he taught, it appears ſufficiently evident, that his doctrine reſembled, in a ſtriking manner, the religous ſyſtem of the ancient Gnoſtics and Manichæans; though, at the ſame time, it is poſſible that the Greeks may have falſified his tenets in ſome reſpects. BASILIUS maintained, that the world and all animal bodies were formed not by the Deity, but by an evil demon who had been caſt down from heaven by the ſupreme Being; from whence he concluded, that the body was no more than the priſon of the immortal ſpirit, and that it was, therefore, to be enervated by faſting, contemplation, and other exerciſes, that ſo the ſoul might be gradually reſtored to its primitive liberty; for this purpoſe alſo wedlock was to be avoided, with many other circumſtances which we have often had occaſion to explain and repeat in the courſe of this hiſtory. It was in conſequence of the ſame principles, that this unfortunate enthuſiaſt denied the *reality* of CHRIST's body, which, like the Gnoſtics and Manichæans, he conſidered only as a phantom, rejected the law of MOSES, and maintained that the body, upon its ſeparation by death, returned to the malignant maſs of matter, without either the proſpect or poſſibility of a future reſurrection to life and felicity. We have ſo many examples of fanatics of this kind in the records of ancient times, and alſo in the hiſtory of this century, that it is by no means to be wondered, that ſome one of them more enterprizing than the reſt ſhould found a ſect among the Greeks. The name of this ſect was taken from the *divine mercy*, which its members are ſaid to have inceſſantly implored; for the word *bogomilus*, in the Myſian language, ſignifies *calling out for mercy from above* [n].

---

certain monks of *Meſopotamia*, who dedicated themſelves wholly to prayer, and held many of the doctrines attributed by Dr. MOSHEIM to the Maſſalians of the XIIth century. See AUGUST. *De Hæreſ.* cap. lvii. and THEOD. *Hæret. Fab.* lib. iv. EPIPHANIUS ſpeaks of another ſort of *Maſſalians* ſtill more ancient, who were mere Gentiles, acknowledged ſeveral gods, yet adored only one whom they called *Almighty*, and had oratories in which they aſſembled to pray and ſing hymns. This reſemblance between the Maſſalians and the Eſſenes, induced SCALIGER to think that EPIPHANIUS confounded the former with the latter.]

[n] See ANNA COMNENA *Alexiados* lib. xv. p. 384. edit. *Venetæ*.—ZONARAS *Annalium*, lib. xviii. p. 336.—JO. CHRIST. WOLF. *Hiſtoria Bogomilorum*, publiſhed at *Witteberg*, in 4to.

The Latin ſects, and the abuſes from whence they ſprung.

III. The Latin ſects were yet more numerous than thoſe of the Greeks, and this will not appear at all ſurprizing to ſuch as conſider the ſtate of religion in the greateſt part of the European provinces. The reign of ſuperſtition, the vices of the clergy, the luxury and indolence of the pontifs and biſhops, the encouragement of impiety by the traffic of *indulgences*, increaſing from day to day, ſeveral pious, though weak men, who had the cauſe of CHRIST, and of his religion at heart, eaſily perceived that both were in a moſt declining and miſerable ſtate, and therefore attempted a reformation in the church, in order to reſtore Chriſtianity to its primitive purity and luſtre. But the knowledge of theſe good men was not equal to their zeal, nor were their abilities in any proportion to the grandeur of their undertakings. The greateſt part of them were deſtitute both of learning and judgment, and, involved in the general ignorance of the times, underſtood but very imperfectly the holy ſcriptures, from whence Chriſtianity was derived, and by which the abuſes that had been mingled with it could only be reformed. In a word, few of theſe well-meaning Chriſtians were equal to an attempt ſo difficult and arduous as an univerſal reformation, and the conſequence of this was, that, while they avoided the reigning abuſes, they fell into others that were as little conſiſtent with the genius of true religion, and carried the ſpirit of cenſure and reformation to ſuch an exceſſive length, that it degenerated often into the various extravagancies of enthuſiaſm, and engendred a number of new ſects, that became a new diſhonour to the Chriſtian cauſe.

The Cathari.

IV. Among the ſects that troubled the Latin church during this century the principal place is due to the *Cathariſts*, whom we have had already occaſion to mention [*o*]. This numerous faction, leaving their firſt reſidence, which was in *Bulgaria*, ſpred themſelves throughout almoſt all the European provinces, where they occaſioned much tumult and diſorder; but their fate was unhappy, for, wherever they were caught, they were put to death with the moſt unrelenting cruelty [*p*]. Their religion reſembled the doctrine of the Manichæans and Gnoſtics, on which account they commonly received the denomination of the former, though they differed from the genuine and primitive Manichæans in many reſpects. They all indeed agreed in the following points of doctrine: *viz.* That matter was the ſource of all evil; that the creator of this world was a being diſtinct from the ſupreme Deity; that CHRIST was not cloathed with a real body, neither could be properly ſaid to have been born, or to have ſeen death; that human bodies were the production of the evil principle; and that baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper were uſeleſs inſtitutions, deſtitute of all efficacy and power. They exhorted all who embraced their doctrine to a rigorous abſtinence from animal food, wine, and wedlock, and recommended to them in the moſt pathetic terms

---

1712.—SAM. ANDREÆ *Diſſ. de Bogomilis* in JO. VOIGTII *Bibliotheca Hiſtoriæ Hæreſiologicæ*, tom. i. part. II. p. 121.—CHR. AUG. HEUMANNI *Diſſertat. de Bogomilis*.

[*o*] See CENT. III. PART II. CH. V. § XVIII. but principally for that ſort of *Cathariſts* here mentioned, ſee above CENT. XI. PART II. CH. V. § II.

[*p*] See the accounts given of this unhappy and perſecuted ſect by CHARLES PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, in his *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, tom. i. in which, however, ſeveral circumſtances are omitted.

the moſt ſevere acts of auſterity and mortification. They moreover treated with the utmoſt contempt all the books of the *Old Teſtament*, but expreſſed a high degree of veneration for the *New*, particularly for the *Four Goſpels*; and, to paſs over many other peculiarities in their doctrine, they maintained, that human ſouls endued with reaſon, were ſhut up by an unhappy fate in the dungeons of mortal bodies, from whence they could only be delivered by faſting, mortification, and continence of every kind [q].

TheAthariſts divided into two ſects.

V. Theſe principles and tenets, though they were adopted and profeſſed by the whole ſect, yet were differently interpreted and modified by different doctors. Hence the *Cathariſts* were divided into various ſects, which, however, on account of the general perſecution in which they were all involved, treated each other with candour and forbearance, diſputed with moderation, and were thus careful not to augment their common calamity by inteſtine feuds and animoſities. Out of theſe different factions aroſe two leading and principal ſects of the *Cathariſts*, which were diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by the number of their reſpective followers, and the importance of their differences. The one approached pretty nearly to the Manichæan ſyſtem, held the doctrine of *two eternal Beings*, from whom all things were derived, the *God of light*, who was alſo the father of JESUS CHRIST, and the *principle of darkneſs*, whom they conſidered as the author of the material world. The other believed in *one eternal principle*, the FATHER of CHRIST, and the ſupreme God, by whom alſo they held that the *firſt matter* was created; but they added to this, that the *evil being*, after his rebellion againſt God and his fall from heaven, arranged this original matter according to his fancy, and divided it into four elements, in order to the production of this viſible world. The former maintained, that CHRIST being cloathed with a celeſtial body deſcended thus into the womb of the Virgin, and derived no part of his ſubſtance from her; while the latter taught, that he firſt aſſumed a real body *in* the womb of MARY, though not *from* her [r]. The ſect, which held the doctrine of *two principles*, were called *Albanenſes*, from the name of the place where their ſpiritual ruler reſided; and this ſect was ſubdivided into two, of which one took the name BALAZINANSA, biſhop of *Verona*, and the other that of JOHN DE LUGIO, biſhop of *Bergamo*. The ſect which adhered to the doctrine of *one eternal principle* was alſo ſubdivided into the congregation of *Baioli*, the capital town of the province, and that of *Concoregio*, or *Concorezzo*. The *Albigenſes*, who were ſettled in *France*, belonged to the church or congregation of *Baioli* [s].

---

[q] Beſides the writers which ſhall be mentioned preſently, ſee the *Diſputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum*, publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1703. as alſo BONACURSI *Manifeſtatio Hæreſis Catharorum* in LUC. DACHERII *Spicilegio*, tom. i. p. 208.

[r] See BERN. MONETA *in ſumma adverſus Catharos et Waldenſes*, publiſhed at *Rome*, in the year 1743, by THOM. AUGUST. RICHINI, who prefixed to it a diſſertation concerning the *Cathari*, that is by no means worthy of the higheſt encomiums. MONETA was no mean writer for the time in which he lived. See *Lib.* i. p. 2 & 5. *Lib.* ii. p. 247, &c.

[s] RAYNERI SACHONI *ſumma de Catharis et Leoniſtis* in MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 1761. 1768.—PEREGRINUS PRISGIANUS in MURATORII *Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 93. who exhibits, in a ſort of table, theſe different ſects, but by a miſtake places the *Albigenſes*,

VI. In the internal conſtitution of the church that was founded by this ſect there were many rules and principles of a ſingular nature, which we paſs over in ſilence, as they would oblige us to enter into a detail inconſiſtent with the brevity we propoſe to obſerve in this work. The government of this church was adminiſtred by *biſhops*, and each biſhop had two vicars, of whom one was called the *eldeſt ſon*, and the other the *younger*; while the reſt of the clergy and doctors were comprehended under the general denomination of *deacons* [t]. The veneration, which the people had for the clergy in general, and more eſpecially for the biſhops and their ſpiritual ſons, was carried to a length that almoſt exceeds credibility. The diſcipline obſerved by this ſect was ſo exceſſively rigid and auſtere, that it was practicable only by a certain number of robuſt and determined fanatics. But that ſuch as were not able to undergo this diſcipline might not, on that account, be loſt to the cauſe, it was thought neceſſary, in imitation of the ancient Manicheans, to divide this ſect into two claſſes, one of which was diſtinguiſhed by the title of the *conſolati*, *i. e. comforted*, while the other received only the denomination of *confederates*. The former gave themſelves out for perſons of conſummate wiſdom and extraordinary piety, lived in perpetual celibacy, and led a life of the ſevereſt mortification and abſtinence, without ever allowing themſelves the enjoyment of any worldly comfort. The latter, if we except a few particular rules which they obſerved, lived like the reſt of mankind, but at the ſame time were obliged by a ſolemn agreement they had made with the church, and which, in Italian, they called *la convenenza*, to enter before their death, in their laſt moments, if not ſooner, into the claſs of the *comforted*, and to receive the *conſolamentum*, which was the form of inauguration by which they were introduced into that fanatical order [u].

The Petrobruſſians,

VII. A much more rational ſect was that which was founded about the year 1110 in *Languedoc* and *Provence* by PETER DE BRUYS, who made the moſt laudable attempts to reform the abuſes and to remove the ſuperſtitions that diſfigured the beautiful ſimplicity of the goſpel, and after having engaged in his cauſe a great number of followers, during a laborious miniſtry of twenty years continuance, was burnt at *St. Giles*, in the year 1130, by an enraged populace ſet on by the clergy, whoſe traffic was in danger from the enterprizing ſpirit of this new reformer. The whole ſyſtem of doctrine which this unhappy martyr, whoſe zeal was not without a conſiderable mixture of fanaticiſm, taught to the *Petrobruſſians* his diſciples, is not known; it is however certain, that the five following tenets made a part of this ſyſtem; 1. That no perſons whatever, were to be baptized before

---

who were a branch of the *Baiolenſes*, in the place of the *Albanenſes*; this, perhaps, may be an error of the preſs. The opinions of theſe *Baiolenſes*, or *Bagnolenſes*, may be ſeen in the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*, which LIMBORCH publiſhed with his *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*. The account, however, which we have in that hiſtory (*Book* I. *Ch.* VIII.) of the opinions of the Albigenſes is by no means accurate. A great variety of cauſes has contributed to involve in darkneſs and perplexity the diſtinctive characters of theſe different ſects, whoſe reſpective ſyſtems we cannot enlarge upon at preſent.

[t] See SACHONI *ſumma de Catharis*, p. 1766.

[u] For a farther account of this ſect, ſee the writers mentioned above, and particularly the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*.

they were come to the full uſe of their reaſon. 2. That it was an idle ſuperſtition to build churches for the ſervice of God, who will accept of a ſincere worſhip wherever it is offered, and that therefore ſuch churches as had already been erected were to be pulled down and deſtroyed. 3. That the crucifixes, as inſtruments of ſuperſtition, deſerved the ſame fate. 4. That the real body and blood of Chriſt were not exhibited in the euchariſt, but were merely repreſented, in that holy ordinance, by their figures and ſymbols. 5. and laſtly, That the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living, could be in no reſpect advantageous to the dead [w].

The Henricians.

VIII. This innovator was ſucceeded by another, who was an Italian by birth, and whoſe name was HENRY, the founder and parent of the ſect called *Henricians*. It was, no doubt, a rare thing to ſee a perſon, who was at the ſame time monk and hermit, undertaking to reform the ſuperſtitions of the times; yet ſuch was the caſe of HENRY, who leaving *Lauſanne*, a city in *Switzerland*, travelled to *Mans*, and being baniſhed thence removed ſucceſſively to *Poitiers*, *Bourdeaux*, and the countries adjacent, and at length to *Thoulouſe* in the year 1147, exerciſing his miniſterial function in all theſe places with the utmoſt applauſe from the people, and declaiming, with the greateſt vehemence and fervor, againſt the vices of the clergy, and the ſuperſtitions they had introduced into the Chriſtian church. At *Thoulouſe* he was warmly oppoſed by St. BERNARD, by whoſe influence he was overpowered, notwithſtanding his popularity, and obliged to ſave himſelf by flight. But being ſeized, in his retreat, by a certain biſhop, he was carried before pope EUGENIUS III, who preſided in perſon at a council then aſſembled at *Rheims*, and who, in conſequence of the accuſations brought againſt HENRY, committed him, in the year 1148, to a cloſe priſon, where, in a little time after this, he ended his days [x]. We have no accurate account of the doctrines of this reformer tranſmitted to our times. All we know of that matter is, that he rejected the baptiſm of infants; cenſured with ſeverity the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy; treated the feſtivals and ceremonies of the church with the utmoſt contempt; and held clandeſtine aſſemblies, in which he explained and inculcated the novelties he taught. Several writers affirm, that he was the diſciple of PETER DE BRUYS; but I cannot ſee upon what evidence or authority this aſſertion is grounded [y].

---

[w] See PETRI *Venerab. Lib. contra Petrobruſſianos in Bibliotheca Clunienſi*, p. 1117.—MABILLON, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 346.—BASNAGE, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées*, period. iv. p. 140.

[x] *Geſta Epiſcoporum Cenomanenſ.* in MABILLON, *Analect. veter. ævi*, p. 315. ed. *Nov.*—GAUFRIDI *Epiſtola in Lib.* vi. *Vitæ Sti. Bernardi*, tom. ii. Opp. *Bernhard.* p. 1207.—MATTH. *Hiſtor. Major.* p. 71.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Opera Bernhardi*, § vi. & *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 346. 420. 434.

[y] That HENRY was the diſciple of PETER DE BRUYS is not at all probable; ſince, not to inſiſt upon other reaſons, the latter could not bear the ſight of a croſs, and in all likelyhood owed his death to the multitude of crucifixes which he had committed to the flames; whereas the former, when he entered into any city, appeared with a croſs in his hand, which he bore as a ſtandard, to attract the veneration of the people. See MABILLON, *Analecta*, p. 316.

The horrid blaſphemy of Tanquelinus.

IX. While the Henricians were propagating their doctrines in *France*, a certain illiterate man, called TANQUELINUS, or TANQUELMUS, aroſe in *Brabant* about the year 1115, excited the moſt deplorable commotions at *Antwerp*, and drew after him a moſt numerous ſect. If the accounts that are given us of this hereſiarch by his adverſaries, may be at all depended upon, he muſt either have been a monſtrous impoſtor, or an outrageous madman. For he walked in public with the greateſt ſolemnity, pretended to be God, or, at leaſt, the ſon of God, ordered daughters to be raviſhed in preſence of their mothers, and committed himſelf the greateſt diſorders. Such are the enormities that are attributed to TANQUELMUS, but they are abſolutely incredible, and therefore cannot be true [z]. What ſeems moſt worthy of credit in this matter is, that this new teacher had imbibed the opinions and ſpirit of the Myſtics; that he treated with contempt the external worſhip of God, the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, and the rite of baptiſm; and held clandeſtine aſſemblies to propagate more effectually his viſionary notions. But as beſides all this, he inveighed againſt the clergy, like the other heretics already mentioned, and declaimed againſt their vices with vehemence and intrepidity, it is probable that theſe blaſphemies were falſely charged upon him by a vindictive prieſthood. Be that as it may, the fate of TANQUELMUS was unhappy, for he was aſſaſſinated by an eccleſiaſtic in a cruel manner. His ſect, however, did not periſh with him, but acquired ſtrength and vigour under the miniſtry of his diſciples, until it was, at length, extinguiſhed by the famous St. NORBERT, the founder of the order of *Præmonſtratenſes*, or *Premontrés* [a].

Seditions excited in *Italy* by Arnold of *Breſcia*.

X. In *Italy* ARNOLD of *Breſcia*, a diſciple of ABELARD, and a man of extenſive erudition and remarkable auſterity, but alſo of a turbulent and impetuous ſpirit, excited new troubles and commotions both in church and ſtate. He was, indeed, condemned in the council of the Lateran, A. D. 1139, by INNOCENT II, and thereby obliged to retire into *Switzerland*; but upon the death of that pontif he returned into *Italy*, and raiſed at *Rome*, during the pontificate of EUGENIUS III, ſeveral tumults and ſeditions among the people, who changed, by his inſtigation, the government of the city, and inſulted the perſons of the clergy in the moſt diſorderly manner. He fell however at laſt a victim to the vengeance of his enemies; for, after various turns of fortune, he was ſeized, in the year 1155, by a prefect of the city, by whom he was crucified, and afterwards burned to aſhes. This unhappy man ſeems not to have adopted any doctrines inconſiſtent with the ſpirit of true religion, and the principles upon which he acted were chiefly reprehenſible from their being carried too far, applied without diſcernment and diſcretion, and executed with a degree of vehemence which was as criminal, as it was imprudent. Having perceived the diſcords and animoſities, the calamities and diſorders that ſprung from the overgrown opulence of the pontifs and biſhops, he was perſuaded that the intereſts of the church, and the happineſs of nations in general required, that the clergy ſhould be diveſted of all their worldly poſſeſſions, of all their temporal rights and prerogatives. He, therefore, maintained publicly, that the treaſures and revenues of popes, biſhops, and monaſteries ought to be ſolemnly reſigned and transferred to the ſupreme rulers of each ſtate, and that nothing was to be left to the miniſters of the goſpel but a ſpiritual authority and a ſubſiſtence drawn from tithes, and from the voluntary oblations and contributions of the people [*b*]. This violent reformer, in whoſe character and manners there were ſeveral things worthy of eſteem, drew after him a great number of diſciples, who derived from him the denomination of *Arnoldiſts*, and, in ſucceeding times, diſcovered the ſpirit and intrepidity of their leader, as often as any favorable opportunities of reforming the church were offered to their zeal.

---

[z] *Epiſtola Trajectenſ. Eccleſiæ ad Tridericum Epiſcopum de Tanchelmo*, in SEL. TENGNAGELII *Collectione Veterum Monumentor.* p. 368.—BOULAY *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 98.—ARGENTRE *Collectio Judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 10.

[a] LEWIS HUGO *Vie de S. Norbert, Lior.* II. p. 126.—CHRYS. vander STERRE *Vita S. Norberti*, cap. xxxvi. p. 164. & POLYC. de HERTOGHE *ad illam Annotationes*, p. 387.

The origin and hiſtory of the Waldenſes.

XI. Of all the ſects that aroſe in this century none was more diſtinguiſhed by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the teſtimony which its bittereſt enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenſes, ſo called from their parent and founder PETER WALDUS. This ſect was known by different denominations. From the place where it firſt appeared its members were called *The poor men of Lions* [*c*], or *Leoniſts*, and, from the wooden ſhoes which its doctors wore, and a certain mark that was imprinted upon theſe ſhoes, they were called *Inſabbatati*, or *Sabbatati* [*c*]. The origin of this famous ſect was as follows: PETER, an opulent merchant of *Lions*, ſurnamed *Valdenſis*, or *Validiſius*, from *Vaux*, or *Waldum*, a town in the marquiſate of *Lions*, being extremely zealous for the advancement of true piety and Chriſtian knowledge, employed [*d*] a certain prieſt [*e*], about the year 1160, in tranſlating from Latin into French the *Four Goſpels*, with other books of Holy Scripture and the moſt remarkable ſentences of the ancient doctors, which were ſo highly eſteemed in this century. But no ſooner had he peruſed theſe ſacred books with a proper degree of attention, than he perceived that the religion, which was now taught in the Roman church, differed totally from that which was originally inculcated by CHRIST and his apoſtles. Struck with this glaring contradiction between the doctrines of the pontifs and the truths of the goſpel, and animated, with a pious zeal, for promoting his own ſalvation and that of others, he abandoned his mercantile vocation, diſtributed his riches among the poor [f], and forming an aſſociation with other pious men, who had adopted his ſentiments and his turn of devotion, he began, in the year 1180, to aſſume the quality of a public teacher, and to inſtruct the multitude in the doctrines and precepts of Chriſtianity. The archbiſhop of *Lions*, and the other rulers of the church in that province, oppoſed, with vigour, this new doctor in the exerciſe of his miniſtry. But their oppoſition was unſucceſsful; for the purity and ſimplicity of that religion which theſe good men taught, the ſpotleſs innocence that ſhone forth in their lives and actions, and the noble contempt of riches and honours which was conſpicuous in the whole of their conduct and converſation, appeared ſo engaging to all ſuch as had any ſenſe of true piety, that the number of their diſciples and followers increaſed from day to day [g]. They accordingly formed religious aſſemblies, firſt in *France*, and afterwards in *Lombardy*, from whence they propagated their ſect throughout the other provinces of *Europe* with an incredible rapidity, and with ſuch invincible fortitude, that neither fire, nor ſword, nor the moſt cruel inventions of mercileſs perſecution could damp their zeal, or entirely ruin their cauſe [h].

[*b*] See OTTO *Friſing. de geſtis Frederici* I, lib. ii. cap. xx.—S. BERNHARDUS *Epiſt.* 195, 196. tom. i. p. 187.—BOULAY *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 157.—MURATORII *Droits de l'Empire ſur l'Etat Eccleſiaſtique*, p. 137.—HENR. de BUNAU *Vita Frederici* I, p. 41.—CHAUFEPIED *Nouveau Diction. Hiſt. Crit.* tom. ii. p. 482.

[*c*] They were called *Leoniſts* from *Leona*, the ancient name of *Lyons*, where their ſect took its riſe. The more eminent perſons of that ſect manifeſted their progreſs toward perfection by the ſimplicity and meanneſs of their external appearance. Hence, among other things, they wore wooden ſhoes, which in the French language are termed *ſabots*, and had imprinted upon theſe ſhoes the ſign of the croſs to diſtinguiſh themſelves from other Chriſtians; and it was on theſe accounts that they acquired the denominations of *ſabbatati* and *inſabbatati*. See DU FRESNE *Gloſſarium Latin. medii ævi*, vi. *voce Sabbatati*, p. 4.—NICOL. EUMERICI *Directorium Inquiſitorum*, part. III. N 112, &c.

[*d*] See STEPH. de BORBONE *De ſeptem donis ſpiritus ſancti*, in ECHARD & QUETIF *Bibliotheca Scriptor. Dominicanor.* tom. i. p. 192.—ANONYM. *Tractatio de Hæreſi Pauperum de Lugduno*, in MARTENE *Theſauro Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 1777.

[*e*] This prieſt was called STEPHANUS DE EVISA.

The doctrine, diſcipline, and views of the Waldenſes.

XII. The attempts of PETER WALDUS and his followers were neither employed, nor deſigned to introduce new doctrines into the church, nor to propoſe new articles of faith to Chriſtians. All they aimed at was, to reduce the form of eccleſiaſtical government, and the lives and manners both of the clergy and people, to that amiable ſimplicity, and that primitive ſanctity that characteriſed the apoſtolic ages, and which appear ſo ſtrongly recommended in the precepts and injunctions of the divine author of our holy religion. In conſequence of this deſign, they complained that the Roman church had degenerated, under CONSTANTINE the Great, from its primitive purity and ſanctity. They denied the ſupremacy of the Roman pontif, and maintained that the rulers and miniſters of the church were obliged, by their vocation, to imitate the poverty of the apoſtles, and to procure for themſelves a ſubſiſtence by the work of their hands. They conſidered every Chriſtian, as in a certain meaſure qualified and authoriſed to inſtruct, exhort, and confirm the brethren in their chriſtian courſe, and demanded the reſtoration of the ancient penitential diſcipline of the church, *i. e.* the expiation of tranſgreſſions by prayer, faſting, and alms, which the new-invented doctrine of *indulgences* had almoſt totally aboliſhed. They, at the ſame time, affirmed, that every pious Chriſtian was qualified and entitled to preſcribe to the penitent the kind and degree of *ſatisfaction* or expiation that their tranſgreſſions required; that confeſſion made to prieſts was by no means neceſſary, ſince the humble offender might acknowledge his ſins and teſtify his repentance to any true believer, and might expect from ſuch the counſels and admonitions that his caſe and circumſtances demanded. They maintained, that the power of delivering ſinners from the guilt and puniſhment of their offences belonged to God alone, and that *indulgences*, of conſequence, were the criminal inventions of ſordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were inſtituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, uſeleſs, and abſurd, and denied the exiſtence of departed ſouls in an intermediate ſtate of purification, affirming, that they were immediately, upon their ſeparation from the body, received into heaven, or thruſt down to hell. Theſe and other tenets of a like nature compoſed the ſyſtem of doctrine propagated by the Waldenſes. Their rules of practice were extremely auſtere; for they adopted, as the model of their moral diſcipline, the Sermon of CHRIST on the mount, which they interpreted and explained in the moſt rigorous and literal manner, and, of conſequence, prohibited and condemned in their ſociety all wars, and ſuits of law, all attempts towards the acquiſition of wealth, the inflicting of capital puniſhments, ſelf-defence againſt unjuſt violence, and oaths of all kinds [*i*].

---

[f] It was on this account that the Waldenſes were called *Pauvres de Lions*, or *Poor men of Lions*.

[g] Certain writers give different accounts of the origin of the *Waldenſes*, and ſuppoſe that they were ſo called from the *Vallies* in which they had reſided for many ages before the birth of PETER WALDUS. But theſe writers have no authority to ſupport this aſſertion, and, beſides this, they are refuted amply by the beſt hiſtorians. I don't mean to deny, that there were in the *Vallies of Piedmont*, long before this period, a ſet of men who differed widely from the opinions adopted and inculcated by the church of *Rome*, and whoſe doctrine reſembled, in many reſpects, that of the Waldenſes; all that I maintain is, that theſe inhabitants of the *Vallies* abovementioned are to be carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Waldenſes, who, according to the unanimous voice of hiſtory, were originally inhabitants of *Lyons*, and derived their name from PETER WALDUS, their founder and chief.

[h] See the following ancient writers, who have given accounts of the ſect in queſtion, *to wit*, SACHONI *Summa contra Valdenſes*.—MONETÆ *Summa contra Catharos et Valdenſes*, publiſhed by RICHINI.—*Tr. di Hæreſi Pauperum de Lugduno*, publiſhed by MARTENE, in his *Theſaurus Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 1777.—PILICHDORFFIUS *contra Valdenſes*, t. xxv. *B. B. Max. Patr.*—Add to theſe authors, JO. PAUL PERRIN *Hiſtoire des Vaudois*, publiſhed at *Geneva* in 1619.—JO. LEGER *Hiſtoire Generale des Egliſes Vaudoiſes*, livr. i. ch. xiv. p. 136.—USSERII *De Succeſſione Eccleſiarum Occidentis*, cap. viii. p 209.—JAC. BASNAGE *Hiſtoire des Egliſes Reformées*, tom. i. period. iv. p. 329.—THOM. AUGUST. RICHINI *Diſſertat. de Valdenſibus*, prefixed to his edition of the *Summa* MONETÆ, p. 36.—BOULAY *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 292.

The form of church government among the Waldenſes.

XIII. The government of the church was committed, by the Waldenſes, to *biſhops* [*k*], *preſbyters*, and *deacons*; for they acknowledged, that theſe three eccleſiaſtical orders were inſtituted by CHRIST himſelf. But they looked upon it as abſolutely neceſſary, that all theſe orders ſhould reſemble exactly the apoſtles of the divine Saviour, and be, like them, illiterate, poor, deſtitute of all worldly poſſeſſions, and furniſhed with ſome laborious trade or vocation in order to gain by conſtant induſtry their daily ſubſiſtence [*l*].

[*i*] See the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*, publiſhed by LIMBORCH, as alſo the *Summa* MONETÆ *contra Waldenſes*, and the other writers of the Waldenſian hiſtory. Though theſe writers are not all equally accurate, nor perfectly agreed about the number of doctrines, that entered into the ſyſtem of this ſect, yet they are almoſt all unanimous in acknowledging the ſincere piety and exemplary conduct of the Waldenſes, and ſhew plainly enough that their intention was not to oppoſe the doctrines that were univerſally received among Chriſtians, but only to revive the piety and manners of the primitive times, and to combat the vices of the clergy, and the abuſes that had been introduced into the worſhip and diſcipline of the church.

[*k*] The biſhops were alſo called *majorales*, or *elders*.

[*l*] The greateſt part of the *Waldenſes* gained their livelihood by weaving; hence the whole ſect in certain places were called the *ſect of weavers*.

The laity were divided into two claſſes; one of which contained the *perfect*, and the other the *imperfect* Chriſtians. The former ſpontaneouſly diveſted themſelves of all worldly poſſeſſions, manifeſted, in the wretchedneſs of their apparel, their exceſſive poverty, and emaciated their bodies by frequent faſting. The latter lived in a leſs auſtere manner, and approached nearer to the method of living generally received, though they abſtained, like the graver ſort of anabaptiſts in later times, from all appearance of pomp and luxury. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the Waldenſes were not without their inteſtine diviſions. Such of them as lived in *Italy* differed conſiderably in their opinions from thoſe who dwelt in *France* and the other European nations. The former conſidered the church of *Rome* as the church of CHRIST, though much corrupted and ſadly disfigured; they acknowledged moreover the validity of its ſeven ſacraments, and ſolemnly declared that they would continue always in communion with it, provided they might be allowed to live as they thought proper, without moleſtation or reſtraint. The latter affirmed, on the contrary, that the church of *Rome* had apoſtatized from CHRIST, was deprived of the holy ſpirit, and was, in reality, that *whore of Babylon* mentioned in the *Revelations of St.* JOHN [*m*].

Sects of a leſs eminent kind. The Paſagini,

XIV. Beſides theſe famous ſects, which made a great noiſe in the world, and drew after them multitudes from the boſom of a corrupt and ſuperſtitious church, there were other religious *factions* of leſſer importance, which aroſe in *Italy*, and more eſpecially in *France*, though they ſeem to have expired ſoon after their birth [*n*]. In *Lombardy*, which was the principal reſidence of the Italian heretics, there ſprung up a very ſingular ſect, known by the denomination of *Paſaginians* [*o*], and alſo by that of the *circumciſed*. Like the other ſects already mentioned, they had the utmoſt averſion to the dominion and diſcipline of the church of *Rome*; but they were, at the ſame time, diſtinguiſhed by two religious tenets that were peculiar to themſelves. The firſt was a notion, that the obſervation of the law of MOSES, in every thing except the offering of ſacrifices, was obligatory upon Chriſtians, in conſequence of which they circumciſed their followers, abſtained from thoſe meats, the uſe of which was prohibited under the Moſaic œconomy, and celebrated the Jewiſh Sabbath. The ſecond tenet that diſtinguiſhed this ſect was advanced in oppoſition to the doctrine of three perſons in the divine nature; for the *Paſaginians* maintained that CHRIST was no more than the *firſt and pureſt creature of God*; nor will their adopting this opinion ſeem ſo ſurpriſing, if we conſider the prodigious number of Arians that were ſcattered throughout *Italy* long before this period of time [p].

[*m*] MONETÆ *Summa contra Catharos et Valdenſes*, p. 406. 416, &c. They ſeem to have been alſo divided in their ſentiments concerning the poſſeſſion of worldly goods, as appears from the accounts of STEPHANUS DE BORBONE, in ECHARDI *Scriptoribus Dominicanis*, tom. i. p. 191. This writer divides the *Waldenſes* into two claſſes; *The poor men of Lions*, and *The poor men of Lombardy*. The former rejected and prohibited all ſorts of poſſeſſions; the latter looked upon worldly poſſeſſions as lawful. This diſtinction may be alſo confirmed by ſeveral paſſages of other ancient authors.

[*n*] For an account of theſe obſcurer ſects, ſee STEPHANUS DE BORBONE, in ECHARDI *Scriptoribus Dominicanis*, tom. i. p. 191.

[*o*] The origin of the name of *Paſagini*, or *Paſagii*, is not known.

The Caputiati.

XV. A ſet of fanatics, called *Caputiati*, from a ſingular kind of cap that was the badge of their faction, infeſted the province of *Burgundy*, the dioceſe of *Auxerre*, and ſeveral other parts of *France*, in all which places they excited much diſturbance among the people. They wore upon their caps a leaden image of the Virgin MARY, and they declared publicly, that their purpoſe was to level all diſtinctions, to abrogate magiſtracy, to remove all ſubordination among mankind, and to reſtore that primitive liberty, that natural equality that were the ineſtimable privileges of the firſt mortals. HUGO, biſhop of *Auxerre*, attacked theſe diſturbers of human ſociety in the proper manner, employing againſt them the force of arms, inſtead of arguments [q].

The ſect of the *apoſtolics*, whom St. BERNARD oppoſed with ſuch bitterneſs and fury, and who were ſo called, as that zealous abbot himſelf acknowledged, becauſe they profeſſed to exhibit in their lives and manners the piety and virtues of the holy apoſtles, were very different from the audacious heretics now mentioned. They were a clowniſh ſet of men, of the loweſt birth, who gained their ſubſiſtence by bodily labour; and yet no ſooner did they form themſelves into a ſect, than they drew after them a multitude of adherents of all ranks and orders. Their religious doctrine, as St. BERNARD confeſſes, was free from error, and their lives and manners were irreproachable and exemplary. Yet they were reprehenſible on account of the following peculiarities: 1. They held it unlawful to take an oath. 2. They ſuffered their hair and their beards to grow to an enormous length, ſo that their aſpect was inexpreſſibly extravagant and ſavage. 3. They preferred celibacy before wedlock, and called themſelves the *chaſte brethren and ſiſters*. Notwithſtanding which, 4. Each man had a ſpiritual ſiſter with him, after the manner of the apoſtles, with whom he lived in a domeſtic relation, lying in the ſame chamber with her, though not in the ſame bed [r].

Eon, a wrong-headed fanatic.

XVI. In the council, which was aſſembled at *Rheims* in the year 1148, and at which pope EUGENIUS III preſided, a certain gentleman of the province of *Bretagne*, whoſe name was EON, and whoſe brain was, undoubtedly, diſordered, was condemned for pretending to be the ſon of God. Having heard in the form that was uſed for exorciſing malignant ſpirits, theſe words pronounced: *per* EUM, *qui venturus eſt judicare vivos et mortuos*, he concluded from the reſemblance that there was between the word EUM, and his name, that he was the perſon who was to come and judge both quick and dead. This poor man ſhould rather have been delivered over to the phyſicians, than placed in the liſt of heretics. He ended his days in a miſerable priſon, and

---

[p] See F. BONACURSI *Manifeſtatio hæreſis Catharorum*, in LUC. DACHERII SPICILEGIO *Veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 211. edit. nov.—GERHARD BERGAMENSIS *contra Catharos et Paſagios*, in LUD. ANTON. MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 151.

[q] JAC. LE BOEUF *Memoires ſur l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 317.

[r] St. BERNHARDUS *Sermo* LXV, *in Canticum*, tom. iv. Opp. p. 1495. edit. *Mabillon*.

CENT. XII. left a conſiderable number of followers and adherents, whom perſecution and death in the moſt dreadful forms could not perſuade to abandon his cauſe, or to renounce an abſurdity, which one would think could never have gained credit, but in ſuch a place as Bedlam [*s*]. This remarkable example is ſufficient to ſhew, not only the aſtoniſhing credulity of the ſtupid multitude, but alſo how far even the rulers of the church were deſtitute of judgment, and ſtrangers to the knowledge of true and genuine religion.

[*s*] MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtoria Major*, p. 68.—GUIL. NEUBRIGENSIS, *Hiſtoria rerum Anglicarum*, lib. i. p. 50.—BOULAY, *Hiſtoria Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 241.

THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

The ſtate of Chriſtianity in the northern parts of *Aſia* and in *China*.

I. THOUGH the ſucceſſors of **GENGIS-KAN**, the mighty emperor of the Tartars, or rather of the Mogols, had carried their victorious arms through a great part of *Aſia*, and having reduced *China*, *India*, and *Perſia* under their yoke, involved in many calamities and ſufferings the Chriſtian aſſemblies which were eſtabliſhed in theſe vanquiſhed lands [a]; yet we learn from the beſt accounts and the moſt reſpectable authorities, that both in *China* and in the Northern parts of *Aſia* the Neſtorians continued to have a flouriſhing church, and a great number of adherents. The emperors of the Tartars and Mogols had no great averſion to the Chriſtian religion; nay, it appears from authentic records, that ſeveral kings and grandees of theſe nations had either been inſtructed in the doctrines of the goſpel by their anceſtors, or were converted to Chriſtianity by the miniſtry and exhortations of the Neſtorians [b]. But the religion of MAHOMET, which was ſo adapted to flatter the paſſions of men, infected, by degrees, theſe noble converts, oppoſed with ſucceſs the progreſs of the goſpel, and, in proceſs of time, triumphed over it ſo far, that not the leaſt glimpſe, or remains of Chriſtianity, were to be perceived in the courts of theſe eaſtern princes.

[a] GREGOR. ABULPHARAIUS, *Hiſtoria Dynaſtiar.* p. 281.

[b] See MARC. PAUL VENETUS, *De Regionibus Oriental.* lib. i. c. iv. lib. ii. c. vi.—HAYTHO, the Armenian's *Hiſtor. Oriental.* cap. xix. p. 35. cap. xxiii. p. 39. cap. xxiv. p. 41.—JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. part. II. p. 526. See particularly the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Tartars*, publiſhed in Latin at *Helmſtadt*, in the year 1741, in 4to.

A papal embaſſy is ſent to the Tartars.

II. The Tartars having made an incurſion into *Europe* in the year 1741, and having laid waſte, with the moſt unrelenting and ſavage barbarity, *Hungary*, *Poland*, *Sileſia*, and the adjacent countries, the Roman pontifs thought it incumbent upon them to endeavour to calm the fury, and ſoften the ferocity of theſe new and formidable enemies. For this purpoſe INNOCENT IV ſent an embaſſy to the Tartars, which conſiſted in a certain number of Dominican and Franciſcan friars [c]. In the year 1274, ABAKA, the emperor of that fierce nation, ſent ambaſſadors to the council of *Lyons*, which was held under the pontificate of GREGORY X [d]. About four years after this, pope NICOLAS III paid the ſame compliment to COBLAI, emperor of the whole Tartar nation, to whom he ſent a ſolemn embaſſy of Franciſcan monks, with a view to render that prince propitious to the Chriſtian cauſe. The laſt expedition of this kind that we ſhall mention at preſent, was that of JOHANNES à MONTE CORVINO, who was ſent in company with other eccleſiaſtics to the ſame emperor by NICOLAS IV, and who carried letters to the Neſtorians from that zealous pontif. This miſſion was far from being uſeleſs, ſince theſe ſpiritual ambaſſadors converted many of the Tartars to Chriſtianity, engaged conſiderable numbers of the Neſtorians to adopt the doctrine and diſcipline of the church of *Rome*, and erected churches in different parts of *Tartary* and *China*. In order to accelerate the propagation of the goſpel among theſe darkened nations, JOHANNES à MONTE CORVINO tranſlated the *New Teſtament* and the *Pſalms of* DAVID into the language of the Tartars [e].

Cruſades renewed.

III. The Roman pontifs employed their moſt zealous and aſſiduous efforts in the ſupport of the Chriſtian cauſe in *Paleſtine*, which was now in a moſt declining or rather in a deſperate ſtate. They had learnt, by a delicious experience, how much theſe Aſiatic wars, undertaken from a principle, or at leaſt carried on under a pretext of religion, had contributed to fill their coffers, augment their authority, and cover them with glory, and therefore they had nothing more at heart than the renewal and prolongation of theſe ſacred expeditions [f]. INNOCENT III, therefore, ſounded the charge; but the greateſt part of the European princes and nations were deaf to the voice of the holy trumpet. At length, however, after many unſucceſsful attempts in different countries, a certain number of French nobles entered into an alliance with the republic of *Venice*, and ſet ſail for the eaſt with an army, that was far from being formidable. Beſides; the event of this new expedition was by no means anſwerable to the expectations of the pontif. The

---

[c] See LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor*. tom. iii. p. 116. 149. 175. 256.

[d] WADDING, *loc. cit.* tom. iv. p. 35. tom. v. p. 128. See particularly an accurate and ample account of the negociations that paſſed between the pontifs and the Tartars, in the *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica Tartarorum*, already mentioned.

[e] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Annal. Eccleſiaſtic.* tom. xiv. *ad A.* 1278. § 17. p. 282. & *ad A.* 1289. § 59. p. 419. ed. *Colon.*—PIERRE BERGERON, *Traité des Tartares*, chap. xi. p. 61. See alſo the writers mentioned in the *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica Tartarorum*.

[f] This is remarked by the writers of the xiith century, who had ſo ſoon perceived the avaritious and deſpotic views of the pontifs in the encouragement they gave to the cruſades. See MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſt. Major*, p. 174. 365. *et paſſim*.

French and Venetians, inſtead of ſteering their courſe towards *Paleſtine*, ſailed directly for *Conſtantinople*, and, in the year 1203, took that imperial city by ſtorm, with a deſign to reſtore to the throne ISAAC ANGELUS, who implored their ſuccour againſt the violence of his brother ALEXIUS, who had uſurped the empire. The year following a dreadful ſedition was raiſed at *Conſtantinople*, in which the emperor ISAAC was put to death, and his ſon the young ALEXIUS was ſtrangled by ALEXIUS DUCAS, the ring-leader of this furious faction [*g*]. The account of this parricide no ſooner came to the ears of the chiefs of the cruſade than they made themſelves maſters of *Conſtantinople* for the ſecond time, dethroned and drove from the city the tyrant DUCAS, and elected BALDWIN, count of *Flanders*, emperor of the Greeks. This proceeding was a ſource of new diviſions; for about two years after this the Greeks reſolved to ſet up, in oppoſition to this Latin emperor, one of their own nation, and elected for that purpoſe THEODORE LASCARIS, who choſe *Nice* in *Bithynia* for the place of his imperial reſidence. From this period until the year 1261, two emperors reigned over the Greeks; the one of their own nation, who reſided at *Nice*; and the other of Latin or French extraction, who lived at *Conſtantinople*, the ancient metropolis of the empire. But in the year 1261, the face of things was changed by the Grecian emperor MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, who, by the valour and ſtratagems of his general CÆSAR ALEXIUS, became maſter of *Conſtantinople*, and forced the Latin emperor BALDWIN II to abandon that city, and ſave himſelf by flight in *Italy*. Thus fell the empire of the Franks at *Conſtantinople*, after a duration of fifty-ſeven years [*h*].

Another cruſade undertaken.

IV. Another ſacred expedition was undertaken in the year 1217, under the pontificate of HONORIUS III, by the confederate arms of *Italy* and *Germany*. The allied army was commanded in chief by ANDREW, king of *Hungary*, who was joined by LEOPOLD, duke of *Auſtria*, LEWIS of *Bavaria*, and ſeveral other princes. After a few months abſence, ANDREW returned into *Europe*. The remaining chiefs carried on the war with vigour, and, in the year 1220, made themſelves maſters of *Damietta*, the ſtrongeſt city in *Egypt*; but their proſperity was of a ſhort duration, for the year following their fleet was totally ruined by that of the Saracens, their proviſions cut off, and their army reduced to the greateſt ſtraits and difficulties. This irreparable loſs was followed by that of *Damietta*, which blaſted all their hopes, and removed the flattering proſpects which their ſucceſsful beginnings had preſented to their expectations [*i*].

[(*g*) The learned authors of the *Univerſal Hiſtory* call this ring-leader, by miſtake, JOHN DUCAS.]

[*h*] See, for a full account of this empire, DU FRESNE *Hiſtoire de l'Empire de Conſtantinople ſous les Empereurs François*; in the former part of which we find the *Hiſtoire de la Conquête de la Ville de Conſtantinople par les François*, written by GODFREY DE VILLE HARDUIN, one of the French chiefs concerned in the expedition. This work makes a part of the Byzantine hiſtory. See alſo CLAUDE FONTENAY, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. x. p. 216.—GUNTHERI *Monachi. Hiſtor. captæ à Latinis Conſtantinopoleos*, in HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 1.—INNOCENTII III. *Epiſtol. à Baluzio editas*, paſſim.

[*i*] See JAC. DE VITRIACO, *Hiſtor. Oriental.* & MARTIN. SANCTUS, *Secret. fidel. crucis inter Bongarſianos de ſacris bellis ſcriptores, ſeu geſta Dei per Francos.*

V. The

An hiſtorical view of the other cruſades, each in their order.

V. The legates and miſſionaries of the court of *Rome* ſtill continued to animate the languiſhing zeal of the European princes in behalf of the Chriſtian cauſe in *Paleſtine*, and to revive the ſpirit of cruſading, which ſo many calamities and diſaſters had almoſt totally diſtinguiſhed. At length, in conſequence of their lively remonſtrances, a new army was raiſed, and a new expedition undertaken, which excited great expectations, and drew the attention of *Europe*, and that ſo much the more, as it was generally believed that this army was to be commanded by the emperor FREDERIC II. That prince had, indeed, obliged himſelf by a ſolemn promiſe made to the Roman pontif, to take upon him the direction of this expedition, and what added a new degree of force to this engagement, and ſeemed to render the violation of it impoſſible, was the marriage that FREDERIC had contracted, in the year 1223, with JOLANDA, daughter of JOHN, count of *Brienne*, and king of *Jeruſalem*, by which alliance that kingdom was to be added to his European dominions. Yet notwithſtanding all this, the emperor put off his voyage from time to time under various pretexts, and did not ſet out until the year 1228, when, after having been excommunicated on account of his delay by the incenſed pontif GREGORY IX [*k*], he followed with a ſmall train of attendants the troops, who expected, with the moſt anxious impatience, his arrival in *Paleſtine*. No ſooner did he land in that diſputed kingdom, than, inſtead of carrying on the war with vigour, he turned all his thoughts towards peace, and without conſulting the other princes and chiefs of the cruſade, concluded, in the year 1229, a treaty of peace, or rather a truce, of ten years with MELIC-CAMEL, ſultan of *Egypt*. The principal thing ſtipulated in this treaty was, that FREDERIC ſhould be put in poſſeſſion of the city and kingdom of *Jeruſalem*; this condition was immediately executed, and the emperor, entering into the city with great pomp, and accompanied by a numerous train, placed the crown upon his head with his own hands, and, having thus ſettled matters in *Paleſtine*, he returned without delay into *Italy*, to appeaſe the diſcords and commotions which the vindictive and ambitious pontif had excited there in his abſence. So that in reality, notwithſtanding all the reproaches that were caſt upon the emperor by the pope and his creatures, this expedition was by far the moſt ſucceſsful of any that had been yet undertaken againſt the infidels [*l*].

[(*k*) This papal excommunication, which was drawn up in the moſt outrageous and indecent language, was ſo far from exciting FREDERIC to accelerate his departure for *Paleſtine*, that it produced no effect upon him at all, and was, on the contrary, received with the utmoſt contempt. He defended himſelf by his ambaſſadors at *Rome*, and ſhewed that the reaſons of his delay were ſolid and juſt, and not mere pretexts as the pope had pretended. At the ſame time, he wrote a remarkable letter to HENRY III, king of *England*, in which he complains of the inſatiable avarice, the boundleſs ambition, the perfidious and hypocritical proceedings of the Roman pontifs. See FLEURY, *Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique*, livr. lxxix. tom. xvi. p. 601. edit. *Bruxelles*.]

[*l*] See the writers that have compoſed the Hiſtory of the Holy Wars, and of the Life and Exploits of FREDERIC II. See alſo MURATORI *Annales Italiæ*, and the various authors of the Germanic Hiſtory.

VI. The expeditions that followed this, were leſs important and alſo leſs ſucceſsful. In the year 1239, Theobald VI [*m*], count of *Champagne*, and king of *Navarre*, ſet out from *Marſeilles* for the Holy land, accompanied by ſeveral French and German princes, as did alſo, the year following, Richard, Earl of *Cornwal*, brother to Henry III, king of *England*. The iſſue of theſe two expeditions was by no means anſwerable to the preparations which were made to render them ſucceſsful. The former failed through the influence of the emperor's [*n*] ambaſſadors in *Paleſtine*, who renewed the truce with the Mahometans; while, on the other hand, a conſiderable body of Chriſtians were defeated at *Gaza*, and ſuch as eſcaped the carnage returned into *Europe*. This fatal event was principally owing to the diſcords that reigned between the templars, and the knights of St. John of *Jeruſalem*. Hence it came to paſs, that the arrival of Richard, which had been induſtriouſly retarded by Gregory IX, and which had revived, in ſome degree, the hopes of the vanquiſhed, was ineffectual to repair their loſs, and all that this prince could do, was to enter, with the conſent of the allies, into a truce upon as good conditions as the declining ſtate of their affairs would admit of. This truce was accordingly concluded with the ſultan of *Egypt* in the year 1241, after which Richard immediately ſet ſail for *Europe* [*o*].

The expedition of Lewis IX.

VII. The affairs of the Chriſtians in the eaſt declined from day to day. Inteſtine diſcords and ill-conducted expeditions had reduced them almoſt to the laſt extremity, when Lewis IX, king of *France*, who was canoniſed after his death, and is ſtill worſhiped with the utmoſt devotion, attempted their reſtoration. It was in conſequence of a vow, which this prince had made in the year 1248, when he was ſeized with a painful and dangerous illneſs, that he undertook this arduous taſk, and, in the execution of it, he ſet ſail for *Egypt* with a formidable army and a numerous fleet, from a notion that the conqueſt of this province would enable him to carry on the war in *Syria* and *Paleſtine* with more facility and ſucceſs. The firſt attempts of the zealous monarch were crowned with victory; for *Damietta*, that famous Egyptian city, yielded to his arms; but the ſmiling proſpect was ſoon changed, and the progreſs of the war preſented one uniform ſcene of calamity and deſolation. The united horrors of famine and peſtilence overwhelmed the royal army, whoſe proviſions were cut off by the Mahometans, in the year 1150; Robert, earl of *Artois*, the king's own brother, having ſurprized the Saracen army, and, through an exceſs of valour, purſued them too far, was ſlain in the engagement, and, a few days after, the king himſelf with two

---

[(*m*) Dr. Mosheim calls him, by a miſtake, Theobald V. unleſs we are to attribute this fault to an error of the preſs.]

[(*n*) Frederic II, who had ſtill a great party in *Paleſtine*, and did not act in concert with the clergy and the creatures of his bitter enemy Gregory IX, from which diviſion the Chriſtian cauſe ſuffered much.]

[*o*] All theſe circumſtances are accurately related and illuſtrated by the learned George Christ Gebaverus, in his *Hiſtoria Richardi Imperatoris*, lib. i. p. 34.—It appears, however, by the *Epiſtolæ Petri de Vineis*, that Richard was created by Frederic II, his lord lieutenant of the kingdom of *Jeruſalem*, and this furniſhes a probable reaſon why Gregory IX uſed all poſſible means to retard Richard's voyage.

more of his brothers [*p*], and the greateſt part of his army, were taken priſoners in a bloody action after a bold and obſtinate reſiſtance. This valiant monarch, who was endowed with true greatneſs of mind, and who was extremely pious, though after the manner that prevailed in this age of ſuperſtition and darkneſs, was ranſomed at an immenſe price [*q*], and after having ſpent about four years in *Paleſtine*, returned into *France*, in the year 1254, with a handful of men [*r*], the miſerable remains of his formidable army.

A ſecond cruſade undertaken by the ſame monarch.

VIII. No calamities could deject the courage, nor damp the invincible ſpirit of LEWIS; nor did he look upon his vow as fulfilled by what he had already done in *Paleſtine*. He therefore reſolved upon a new expedition, fitted out a formidable fleet with which he ſet ſail for *Africa*, accompanied by a ſplendid train of princes and nobles, and propoſed to begin in that part of the world his operations againſt the infidels, that he might either convert them to the Chriſtian faith, or draw from their treaſures the means of carrying on more effectually the war in *Aſia*. Immediately after his arrival upon the *African* coaſt, he made himſelf maſter of the fort of *Carthage*; but this firſt ſucceſs was ſoon followed by a fatal change in his affairs. A peſtilential diſeaſe broke out in the fleet, in the harbour of *Tunis*, carried off the greateſt part of the army, and ſeized, at length, the monarch himſelf, who fell a victim to its rage, on the 25th of Auguſt, in the year 1270 [*s*]. LEWIS was the laſt of the European princes, that embarked in the holy war; the dangers and difficulties, the calamities and diſorders, and the enormous expences that accompanied each cruſade, diſguſted the moſt zealous, and diſcouraged the moſt intrepid promoters of theſe fanatical expeditions. In conſequence of this the Latin empire in the eaſt declined apace, notwithſtanding the efforts of the Roman pontifs to maintain and ſupport it; and in the year 1291, after the taking of *Ptolomais*, or *Acra*, by the Mahometans, it was entirely overthrown [*t*]. It is natural to inquire into the true cauſes, that contributed to this unhappy revolution in *Paleſtine*; and theſe cauſes are evident. We muſt

---

[(*p*) ALPHONSUS, earl of *Poitiers*, and CHARLES, earl of *Anjou*.]

[(*q*) The ranſom, which, together with the reſtoration of *Damietta*, the king was obliged to pay for his liberty, was eight hundred thouſand gold bezants, and not eighty thouſand as COLLIER erroneouſly reckons *. This ſum, which was equal then to 500,000 livres of French money, would, in our days, amount to the value of four millions of livres, that is, to about 190,000 pounds ſterling.]

[*r*] Of 2800 illuſtrious knights, who ſet out with LEWIS from *France*, there remained but about an hundred when he ſailed from *Paleſtine*. See JOINVILLE's *Hiſt. de S. Louis* IX. p. 81.

[*s*] Among the various hiſtories that deſerve to be conſulted for an ampler account of this laſt cruſade, the prinipal place is due to the *Hiſtoire de S. Louis* IX *du nom, Roy de France, ecrite par Jean Sr. de Joinville, enrichie de nouvelles Diſſertations et Obſervations Hiſtoriques, par Charles du Freſne, Paris* 1668, Fol. See alſo FILLEAU DE LA CHAIZE *Hiſtoire de S. Louis, Paris* 1688, 2 vol. in 8vo.—MENCONIS *Chronicon*, in ANT. MATTHÆI *Analectis veteris ævi*, tom. iii. p. 172. 179.—LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Minorum*, tom. iv. p. 294. 307, & *paſſim*.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 212. 392, &c.—PIERRE CLAUDE FONTENAY, *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xi. p. 337. 405. 575.

[*t*] ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. v. p. 748.—JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 422.—IMOLA *in Dantem*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Italicæ, medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1111, 1112.

* See COLLIER's *Eccleſ. Hiſtory*, Cent. XIII. vol. i. p. 456.

not ſeek for them either in the counſels, or in the valour of the infidels, but in the diſſenſions that reigned in the Chriſtian armies, in the profligate lives of thoſe, who called themſelves the champions of the croſs, and in the ignorance and obſtinacy, the avarice and inſolence of the pope's legates.

Converſion of the Pruſſians.

IX. Chriſtianity as yet had not tamed the ferocity, nor conquered the Pagan ſuperſtitions and prejudices that ſtill prevailed in ſome of the weſtern provinces. Among others, the Pruſſians, a fierce and ſavage nation, retained ſtill the idolatrous worſhip of their anceſtors with the moſt obſtinate perſeverance, nor did the arguments and exhortations employed by the miſſionaries that were ſent among them, from time to time, produce the leaſt effect upon their ſtubborn and intractable ſpirits. The brutiſh firmneſs of theſe Pagans induced CONRAD, duke of *Maſſovia*, to have recourſe to more forcible methods than reaſon and argument, in order to bring about their converſion. For this purpoſe, he addreſſed himſelf, in the year 1230, to the knights of the Teutonic order of St. MARY, who, after their expulſion from *Paleſtine*, had ſettled at *Venice*, and engaged them, by pompous promiſes, to undertake the conqueſt and converſion of the Pruſſians. The knights accordingly arrived in *Pruſſia*, under the command of HERMAN DE SALTZA, and, after a moſt cruel and obſtinate war, of fifty years ſtanding, with that reſolute people, obliged them, with difficulty, to acknowledge the Teutonic order for their ſovereigns, and to embrace the Chriſtian faith [u]. After having eſtabliſhed Chriſtianity, and fixed their own dominion in *Pruſſia*, theſe booted apoſtles made ſeveral excurſions into the neighbouring countries, and particularly into *Lithuania*, where they pillaged, burned, maſſacred, and ruined all before them, until they forced the inhabitants of that miſerable province to profeſs a feigned ſubmiſſion to the goſpel, or rather to the furious and unrelenting miſſionaries, by whom it was propagated in a manner ſo contrary to its divine maxims, and to the benevolent ſpirit of its celeſtial author [w].

Of the Arabians in *Spain*.

X. In *Spain* the cauſe of the goſpel gained ground from day to day. The kings of *Caſtile*, *Leon*, *Navarre*, and *Arragon* waged perpetual war with the Saracen princes, who held ſtill under their dominion the kingdoms of *Valentia*, *Granada*, and *Murcia*, together with the province of *Andaluſia*; and this war was carried on with ſuch ſucceſs, that the Saracen dominion declined apace, and was daily reduced within narrower bounds, while the limits of the church were extended on every ſide. The princes that contributed principally to this happy revolution were FERDINAND, king of *Leon* and *Caſtile*, who, after his death, obtained a place in the Kalendar, his father APHONSUS IX, king of *Leon*, and JAMES I, king of *Arragon* [x]. The latter, more eſpecially, diſtinguiſhed himſelf eminently by his fervent zeal for the advancement of Chriſtianity; for no ſooner had he made himſelf maſter of *Valentia* in the year 1236, than he employed, with the greateſt pains and aſſiduity, every poſſible method of converting to the faith his Arabian ſubjects, whoſe expulſion would have been an irreparable loſs to his kingdom. For this purpoſe he ordered the Dominicans, whoſe miniſtry he made uſe of principally in this ſalutary work, to learn the Arabic tongue, and he founded public ſchools at *Majorca* and *Barcelona*, in which a conſiderable number of youth were educated in a manner that might enable them to preach the goſpel in that language. When theſe pious efforts were found to be ineffectual, the Roman pontif CLEMENT IV exhorted the king to drive the Mahometans out of *Spain*. The obſequious prince followed the counſel of the inconſiderate pontif, in the execution of which, however, he met with much difficulty, both from the oppoſition which the Spaniſh nobles made to it on the one hand, and from the obſtinacy of the Moors on the other [y].

---

[u] See MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. iii. p. 18. tom. v. p. 684—689.—PETRI DE DUISBURG *Chronicon Pruſſiæ*, publiſhed by HARTKNOCHIUS at *Jena*, in the year 1679.—CHRISTOPH. HARTKNOCHIUS, his *Hiſtory of the Pruſſian Church*, written in the German language, book I. ch. i. p. 33. and *Antiquitates Pruſſiæ*, *Diſſ.* xiv. p. 201.—BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 427. 478.—WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 40. 63.—SOLIGNAC *Hiſtoire de Pologne*, tom. ii. p. 238.

[w] Beſides the authors mentioned in the preceding note, ſee LUDWIGII *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptorum omnis ævi*, tom. i. p. 336.

[x] See JOH. FERRERAS, *Hiſtory of Spain*, vol. iv.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The unhappy ſtate of the affairs of the Chriſtians in the eaſt.

I. THE accounts we have already given of the conqueſts of the Tartars, and of the unhappy iſſue of the cruſades, will be ſufficient to give us a lively idea of the melancholy condition to which the Chriſtians were reduced in *Aſia*; and had the Saracens been infected with the ſame odious ſpirit of perſecution that poſſeſſed the cruſaders, there would not perhaps have remained a ſingle Chriſtian in that part of the world. But though theſe infidels were chargeable with various crimes, and had frequently treated the Chriſtians in a rigorous and injurious manner, yet they looked with horror upon thoſe ſcenes of perſecution, which the Latins exhibited as the exploits of heroic piety, and conſidered it as the higheſt and moſt atrocious mark of cruelty and injuſtice to force unhappy men, by fire and ſword, to abandon their religious principles, or to put them to death merely becauſe they refuſed to change their opinions. After the deſtruction of the kingdom of *Jeruſalem*, many of the Latins remained ſtill in *Syria*, and retiring into the dark and ſolitary receſſes of mount *Liban*, lived there in a ſavage manner, and loſt, by degrees, all ſenſe both of religion and humanity, as appears in the conduct and characters of their deſcendants, who ſtill inhabit the ſame uncultivated wilds, and who ſeem almoſt entirely deſtitute of all knowledge of God and religion [z].

---

[y] See GEDDES, his *Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Moriſcoes*, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, vol. i. p. 26.

[z] A certain tribe, called DERUSI, or DRUSI, who inhabit the receſſes of the mounts *Liban* and *Antiliban*, pretend to deſcend from the ancient Franks, who were once maſters of *Paleſtine*. This derivation is, indeed, doubtful. It is, however, certain, that there ſtill remain in theſe countries

Complaints of infidelity and atheiſm among the Latins.

II. The Latin writers of this age complain in many places of the growth of infidelity, of daring and licentious writers, ſome of whom attacked publicly the doctrines of Chriſtianity, while others went ſo far as atheiſtically to call in queſtion the perfections and government of the ſupreme Being. Theſe complaints, however they might have been exaggerated in ſome reſpects, were yet far from being entirely deſtitute of foundation; and the ſuperſtition of the times was too naturally adapted to create a number of infidels and libertines, among men who had more capacity than judgment, more wit than ſolidity. Perſons of this character, when they fixed their attention only upon that abſurd ſyſtem of religion, which the Roman pontifs and their dependents exhibited as the true religion of Christ, and maintained by the odious influence of bloody perſecution, were, for want of the means of being better inſtructed, unhappily led to conſider the Chriſtian religion as a fable invented and propagated by a greedy and ambitious prieſthood, in order to fill their coffers and to render their authority reſpectable. The philoſophy of Aristotle, which flouriſhed in all the European ſchools, and was looked upon as the very eſſence of right reaſon, contributed much to ſupport this deluſion, and to nouriſh a proud and preſumptuous ſpirit of infidelity. This quibbling and intricate philoſophy led many to reject ſome of the moſt evident and important doctrines both of natural and revealed religion, ſuch as the doctrine of a divine providence governing the univerſe, the immortality of the ſoul, the ſcripture account of the origin of the world, and other points of leſs moment. Theſe doctrines were not only rejected, but the moſt pernicious errors were induſtriouſly propagated in oppoſition to them, by a ſet of Ariſtotelians, who were extremely active in gaining proſelytes to their impious jargon [a].

---

deſcendents of thoſe, whom the Holy war brought from *Europe* into *Paleſtine*; though they do very little honour to their anceſtors, and have nothing of Chriſtians but the name.

[a] See Sti. Thomæ *Summa contra gentes,* and Bernhardi Monetæ *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenſes.* This latter writer, in the work now mentioned, combats, with great ſpirit, the enemies of Chriſtianity which appeared in his time. In the fourth chapter of the fifth book, p. 416. he diſputes, in an ample and copious manner, againſt thoſe who affirmed, *that the ſoul periſhed with the body*, refutes, in the eleventh chapter, p. 477. thoſe Ariſtotelian philoſophers, who held, that the world had exiſted from all eternity, and would never have an end; and, in the fifteenth chapter, p. 554. he attacks thoſe, who, deſpiſing the authority of the ſacred writings, deny the exiſtence of *human liberty*, and maintain, that all things, and even the crimes of the wicked are the effects of an *abſolute and irreſiſtible neceſſity.* Add to theſe authors, Stephani Tempierii, *Epiſcopi Pariſienſis, Indiculus errorum, qui a nonnullis Magiſtris Lutetiæ publice privatimque docebantur, Anno* 1277, *in Bibliotheca patrum Maxima,* tom. xxv. p. 233. as alſo Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 433. and Gerardi du Bois, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 501. The tenets of theſe doctors will, no doubt, appear of a ſurprizing nature; for they taught, *that there was only one intellect among all the human race*; *that all things were ſubject to abſolute fate or neceſſity*; *that the univerſe was not governed by a divine providence*; *that the world was eternal, and the ſoul mortal*; and they maintained theſe and ſuch like monſtrous errors by arguments drawn from the philoſophy of Aristotle. But, at the ſame time, to avoid the juſt reſentment of the people, they held up, as a buckler againſt their adverſaries, that moſt dangerous and pernicious diſtinction between *theological* and *philoſophical truth*, which has been ſince uſed, with the utmoſt cunning and bad faith, by the more recent Ariſtotelians of the xv and xvi^th^ centuries. *Theſe things*, ſaid they (as we learn from Stephen Tempier) *are true in philoſophy, but not according to the catholic faith. Vera ſunt hæc ſecundum philoſophum, non ſecundum fidem catholicam.*

diſtinguiſhed himſelf eminently by his fervent zeal for the advancement of Chriſtianity; for no ſooner had he made himſelf maſter of *Valentia* in the year 1236, than he employed, with the greateſt pains and aſſiduity, every poſſible method of converting to the faith his Arabian ſubjects, whoſe expulſion would have been an irreparable loſs to his kingdom. For this purpoſe he ordered the Dominicans, whoſe miniſtry he made uſe of principally in this ſalutary work, to learn the Arabic tongue, and he founded public ſchools at *Majorca* and *Barcelona*, in which a conſiderable number of youth were educated in a manner that might enable them to preach the goſpel in that language. When theſe pious efforts were found to be ineffectual, the Roman pontif CLEMENT IV exhorted the king to drive the Mahometans out of *Spain*. The obſequious prince followed the counſel of the inconſiderate pontif, in the execution of which, however, he met with much difficulty, both from the oppoſition which the Spaniſh nobles made to it on the one hand, and from the obſtinacy of the Moors on the other [*y*].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The unhappy ſtate of the affairs of the Chriſtians in the eaſt.

I. THE accounts we have already given of the conqueſts of the Tartars, and of the unhappy iſſue of the cruſades, will be ſufficient to give us a lively idea of the melancholy condition to which the Chriſtians were reduced in *Aſia*; and had the Saracens been infected with the ſame odious ſpirit of perſecution that poſſeſſed the cruſaders, there would not perhaps have remained a ſingle Chriſtian in that part of the world. But though theſe infidels were chargeable with various crimes, and had frequently treated the Chriſtians in a rigorous and injurious manner, yet they looked with horror upon thoſe ſcenes of perſecution, which the Latins exhibited as the exploits of heroic piety, and conſidered it as the higheſt and moſt atrocious mark of cruelty and injuſtice to force unhappy men, by fire and ſword, to abandon their religious principles, or to put them to death merely becauſe they refuſed to change their opinions. After the deſtruction of the kingdom of *Jeruſalem*, many of the Latins remained ſtill in *Syria*, and retiring into the dark and ſolitary receſſes of mount *Liban*, lived there in a ſavage manner, and loſt, by degrees, all ſenſe both of religion and humanity, as appears in the conduct and characters of their deſcendants, who ſtill inhabit the ſame uncultivated wilds, and who ſeem almoſt entirely deſtitute of all knowledge of God and religion [*z*].

[*y*] See GEDDES, his *Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Moriſcoes*, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, vol. i. p. 26.

[*z*] A certain tribe, called DERUSI, or DRUSI, who inhabit the receſſes of the mounts *Liban* and *Antiliban*, pretend to deſcend from the ancient Franks, who were once maſters of *Paleſtine*. This derivation is, indeed, doubtful. It is, however, certain, that there ſtill remain in theſe countries

Complaints of infidelity and atheiſm among the Latins.

II. The Latin writers of this age complain in many places of the growth of infidelity, of daring and licentious writers, ſome of whom attacked publicly the doctrines of Chriſtianity, while others went ſo far as atheiſtically to call in queſtion the perfections and government of the ſupreme Being. Theſe complaints, however they might have been exaggerated in ſome reſpects, were yet far from being entirely deſtitute of foundation; and the ſuperſtition of the times was too naturally adapted to create a number of infidels and libertines, among men who had more capacity than judgment, more wit than ſolidity. Perſons of this character, when they fixed their attention only upon that abſurd ſyſtem of religion, which the Roman pontifs and their dependents exhibited as the true religion of CHRIST, and maintained by the odious influence of bloody perſecution, were, for want of the means of being better inſtructed, unhappily led to conſider the Chriſtian religion as a fable invented and propagated by a greedy and ambitious prieſthood, in order to fill their coffers and to render their authority reſpectable. The philoſophy of ARISTOTLE, which flouriſhed in all the European ſchools, and was looked upon as the very eſſence of right reaſon, contributed much to ſupport this deluſion, and to nouriſh a proud and preſumptuous ſpirit of infidelity. This quibbling and intricate philoſophy led many to reject ſome of the moſt evident and important doctrines both of natural and revealed religion, ſuch as the doctrine of a divine providence governing the univerſe, the immortality of the ſoul, the ſcripture account of the origin of the world, and other points of leſs moment. Theſe doctrines were not only rejected, but the moſt pernicious errors were induſtriouſly propagated in oppoſition to them, by a ſet of Ariſtotelians, who were extremely active in gaining proſelytes to their impious jargon [a].

---

deſcendents of thoſe, whom the Holy war brought from *Europe* into *Paleſtine*; though they do very little honour to their anceſtors, and have nothing of Chriſtians but the name.

[a] See STI. THOMÆ *Summa contra gentes*, and BERNHARDI MONETÆ *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenſes*. This latter writer, in the work now mentioned, combats, with great ſpirit, the enemies of Chriſtianity which appeared in his time. In the fourth chapter of the fifth book, p. 416. he diſputes, in an ample and copious manner, againſt thoſe who affirmed, *that the ſoul periſhed with the body*, refutes, in the eleventh chapter, p. 477. thoſe Ariſtotelian philoſophers, who held, that the world had exiſted from all eternity, and would never have an end; and, in the fifteenth chapter, p. 554. he attacks thoſe, who, deſpiſing the authority of the ſacred writings, deny the exiſtence of *human liberty*, and maintain, that all things, and even the crimes of the wicked are the effects of an *abſolute and irreſiſtible neceſſity*. Add to theſe authors, STEPHANI TEMPIERII, *Epiſcopi Pariſienſis, Indiculus errorum, qui a nonnullis Magiſtris Lutetiæ publice privatimque docebantur, Anno* 1277, *in Bibliotheca patrum Maxima*, tom. xxv. p. 233. as alſo BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 433. and GERARDI DU BOIS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 501. The tenets of theſe doctors will, no doubt, appear of a ſurprizing nature; for they taught, *that there was only one intellect among all the human race*; *that all things were ſubject to abſolute fate or neceſſity*; *that the univerſe was not governed by a divine providence*; *that the world was eternal, and the ſoul mortal*; and they maintained theſe and ſuch like monſtrous errors by arguments drawn from the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE. But, at the ſame time, to avoid the juſt reſentment of the people, they held up, as a buckler againſt their adverſaries, that moſt dangerous and pernicious diſtinction between *theological* and *philoſophical truth*, which has been ſince uſed, with the utmoſt cunning and bad faith, by the more recent Ariſtotelians of the xv and xvith centuries. *Theſe things*, ſaid they (as we learn from STEPHEN TEMPIER) *are true in philoſophy, but not according to the catholic faith. Vera ſunt hæc ſecundum philoſophum, non ſecundum fidem catholicam.*

III. If

Frederic II accuſed of impiety.

III. If the accuſations brought againſt FREDERIC II, by the Roman pontif GREGORY IX, deſerve any credit, that prince may be ranked among the moſt inveterate and malignant enemies of the Chriſtian religion, ſince he was charged by GREGORY with having ſaid, that *the world had been deceived by three impoſtors*, MOSES, CHRIST, *and* MAHOMET [b]. This charge was anſwered by a ſolemn and public profeſſion of his faith, which the emperor addreſſed to all the kings and princes of *Europe*, to whom alſo had been addreſſed the accuſation brought againſt him by the pontif. The accuſation, however, was founded upon the teſtimony of HENRY RASPON, landgrave of *Thuringia*, who declared that he had heard the emperor pronounce the abominable blaſphemy abovementioned [c]. It is, after all, difficult to decide with ſufficient evidence concerning the truth of this fact. FREDERIC, who was extremely paſſionate and imprudent, may, perhaps in a fit of rage, have let ſome ſuch expreſſion as this eſcape his reflexion, and this is rendered probable enough by the company he frequented, and the number of learned Ariſtotelians that were always about his perſon, and might ſuggeſt matter enough for ſuch impious expreſſions, as that now under conſideration. It was this affair that gave occaſion, in after times, to the invention of that fabulous account, which ſuppoſes the deteſtable book *Concerning the three impoſtors*, to have been compoſed by the emperor himſelf, or, by PETER DE VINEIS, a native of *Capua*, a man of great credit and authority, whom that prince had choſen for his prime miniſter, and in whom he placed the higheſt confidence [d].

---

[b] MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 408. 459.—PETR. DE VINEIS, *Epiſtolarum Lib.* i.

[c] HERM. GYGANTIS, *Flores temporum*, p. 126.—CHR. FRID. AYRMANN, *Sylloge Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 639.

[d] See CASIM. OUDINI *Comment. de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis*, tom. iii. p. 66.—ALB. HENR. DE SALLENGRE, *Mémoires d'Hiſtoire et de Litterature*, tom. i. part. I. p. 386.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of learning and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of learning among the Greeks.

I. THE Greeks, amidſt the dreadful calamities, diſcords, and revolutions, that diſtracted and perplexed their unhappy country, had neither that ſpirit, nor that leiſure that are neceſſary to the culture of the arts and ſciences. Yet, under all theſe diſadvantages, they ſtill retained a certain portion of their former ſpirit, and did not entirely abandon the cauſe of learning and philoſophy, as appears by the writers that aroſe among them during this century. Their beſt hiſtorians were NICETAS CHONIATES, GEORGIUS ACROPOLITA, GREGORIUS PACHYMERES, and JOEL, whoſe *Chronology* is yet extant. We learn from the writings of GREGORY PACHYMERES and NICEPHORUS BLEMMIDA, that the Peripatetic philoſophy was not without its admirers among the Greeks; though the Platonic was moſt in vogue. The greateſt part of the Grecian philoſophers, following the example of the later Platoniſts, whoſe works were the ſubject of their conſtant meditation, inclined to reduce the wiſdom of PLATO, and the ſubtilties of the Stagirite into one ſyſtem, and to reconcile, as well as they could, their jarring principles. It is not neceſſary to exhibit a liſt of thoſe authors, who wrote the lives and diſcourſes of the ſaints, or diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the controverſy with the Latin church, or of thoſe, who employed their learned labours in illuſtrating the canon law of the Greeks. The principal Syrian writer, which this century produced, was GREGORY ABUL FARAI, primate of the Jacobites, a man of true genius and univerſal learning, who was a judicious divine, an eminent hiſtorian, and a good philoſopher [a].

---

[a] See BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article ABULPHARAGE; as alſo JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. cap. xlii. p. 244.

[ABULPHARAGIUS, or AAUL-FARAI, was a native of *Malatia*, a city in *Armenia*, near the ſource of the river *Euphrates*, and acquired a vaſt reputation in the eaſt on account of his extenſive erudition. He compoſed *An Abridgment of the Univerſal Hiſtory*, from the beginning of the world to his own times, which he divided into ten parts, or dynaſties. The *1ſt*, comprehends the hiſtory of the ancient Patriarchs, from *Adam* to *Moſes*. The *2d*, that of *Joſhua* and the other Judges of *Iſrael*. The 3, 4, 5, and 6*th*, contain the hiſtory of the Kings of *Iſrael*, of the Chaldean Princes, of the Perſian Magi, and of the Grecian Monarchs. The 7*th*, relates to the Roman hiſtory; the 8*th*, to that of the Greek Emperors of *Conſtantinople*. In the 9*th*, he treats concerning the Arabian Commanders; and in the 10*th*, concerning the Moguls. He is more to be depended upon in his hiſtory of the Saracens and Tartars, than in his accounts of other nations. The learned Dr. EDWARD POCOCK tranſlated this work into Latin, and publiſhed his tranſlation in 1663; together with a Supplement, which carries on the hiſtory of the Oriental Princes, where ABUL-FARAI left it.

GEORGE ELMACIN, who compoſed the hiſtory of the Saracens, was alſo a writer of no mean reputation.

The progreſs of learning in the weſt.

II. The ſciences carried a fairer aſpect in the weſtern world, where every branch of erudition was cultivated with aſſiduity and zeal, and, of conſequence, flouriſhed, with increaſing vigour, from day to day. The European kings and princes had learned, by a happy experience, how much the advancement of learning and arts contribute to the grandeur and happineſs of a nation; and therefore they invited into their dominions learned men from all parts of the world, nouriſhed the arts in their boſom, excited the youth to the love of letters, by crowning their progreſs with the moſt noble rewards, and encouraged every effort of genius by conferring upon ſuch as excelled the moſt honourable diſtinctions. Among theſe patrons and protectors of learning, the emperor FREDERIC II, and ALPHONSUS X, king of *Leon* and *Caſtile*, two princes as much diſtinguiſhed by their own learning, as by the encouragement they granted to men of genius, acquired the higheſt renown, and rendered their names immortal. The former founded the academy of *Naples*, had the works of ARISTOTLE tranſlated into Latin, aſſembled about his perſon all the learned men, whom he could engage by his munificence to repair to his court, and gave many other undoubted proofs of his zeal for the advancement of the arts and ſciences [*b*]. The latter obtained an illuſtrious and permanent renown by ſeveral learned productions, but more eſpecially by his famous *Aſtronomical Tables* [*c*]. In conſequence then of the protection that was given to the ſciences in this century, academies were erected almoſt in every city, peculiar privileges of various kinds were alſo granted to the youth that frequented them, and theſe learned ſocieties acquired, at length, the form of political bodies; that is to ſay, they were inveſted with a certain juriſdiction, and were governed by their own laws and ſtatutes.

The ſtate of the European academies.

III. In the public ſchools or academies that were founded at *Padua*, *Modena*, *Naples*, *Capua*, *Tholouſe*, *Salamanca*, *Lions*, and *Cologn*, the whole circle of the ſciences was not taught, as in our times. The application of the youth, and the labours of their inſtructors were limited to certain branches of learning, and thus the courſe of academical education remained imperfect. The academy of *Paris*, which ſurpaſſed all the reſt both with reſpect to the number and abilities of its profeſſors, and the multitude of ſtudents by whom it was frequented, was the firſt learned ſociety which extended the ſphere of education, received all the ſciences into its boſom, and appointed maſters for every branch of erudition. Hence it was diſtinguiſhed, before any other academy, with the title of an UNIVERSITY, to denote its

---

The ſame learned tranſlator had obliged the public, in 1650, with an abridgment of the ninth dynaſty under the following title: *Specimen Hiſtoriæ Arabum; ſive Georgii Abulfaragii Malatienſis de origine et moribus Arabum ſuccincta narratio.*]

[*b*] BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 115.—GIANNONE, *Hiſt. de Naples*, tom. ii. p. 497. add to theſe the obſervations of JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 618.

[*c*] NIC. ANTONII *Bibliotheca vetus Hiſpan.* lib. viii. c. v. p. 217.—JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire d'Eſpagne*, tom. iv. p. 347.

embracing the whole circle of ſcience, and, in proceſs of time, other ſchools of learning were ambitious of forming themſelves upon the ſame model, and of being honoured with the ſame title. In this famous univerſity the doctors were divided into four colleges or claſſes, according to the branches of learning they profeſſed; and theſe claſſes were called, in after-times, *faculties*. In each of theſe *faculties* a doctor was choſen by the ſuffrages of his collegues, to preſide during a fixed period in the ſociety, and the title of *dean* was given to thoſe, who ſucceſſively filled that eminent office [d]. The head of the *univerſity*, whoſe inſpection and juriſdiction extended to all the branches of that learned body, was dignified with the name of *chancellor*, and that high and honourable place was filled by the biſhop of *Paris*, to whom an aſſiſtant was afterwards joined, who ſhared the adminiſtration with him, and was cloathed with an extenſive authority [e]. The college ſet apart for the ſtudy of divinity was firſt erected and endowed, in the year 1250, by an opulent and pious man, whoſe name was ROBERT DE SORBONNE, a particular friend and favorite of St. LEWIS, whoſe name was adopted, and is ſtill retained by that theological ſociety [f].

The academical courſe.

IV. Such as were deſirous of being admitted profeſſors in any of the *faculties*, or colleges of this famous univerſity, were obliged to ſubmit to a long and tedious *courſe* of probation, to ſuffer the ſtricteſt examinations, and to give, during ſeveral years, undoubted proofs of their learning and capacity, before they were received in the character of public teachers. This ſevere diſcipline was called the *academical courſe*, and it was wiſely deſigned to prevent the number of profeſſors from multiplying beyond meaſure, and alſo to hinder ſuch as were deſtitute of erudition and abilities from aſſuming an office, which was juſtly looked upon as of high importance. They, who had ſatisfied all the demands of this academical law, and had gone through the formidable trial with applauſe, were ſolemnly inveſted with the dignity of *profeſſors*, and were ſaluted *maſters* with a certain round of ceremonies, that were uſed in the ſocieties of illiterate tradeſmen, when their company was augmented by a new candidate. This vulgar cuſtom was introduced, in the preceding century, by the profeſſors of law in the academy of *Bolonia*, and, in this century, it was tranſmitted to that of *Paris*, where it was firſt practiſed by the divinity-colleges, and afterwards by the profeſſors of phyſic and of the liberal arts. In this account of the trial and inſtallation of the profeſſors of *Paris*, we may perceive the origin of what we now call *academical degrees*, which, like all other human inſtitutions, have degenerated ſadly from the wiſe end for which they were at firſt appointed, and grow more inſignificant from day to day [g].

---

[d] This arrangement was executed about the year 1260. See DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 557. 564.

[e] See HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitates Academicæ*, a work, however, ſuſceptible of conſiderable improvements. The important work mentioned in the preceding note, and which is divided into ſix volumes, deſerves to be principally conſulted in this point, as well as in all others that relate to the hiſtory and government of the univerſity of *Paris*; add to this CLAUD. HEMERÆI *Liber de Academia Pariſienſi, qualis primo fuit in inſula et epiſcoporum ſcholis. Lutet.* 1637, in 4to.

[f] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 223.—DU FRESNE's *Annotations upon the Life of St. Lewis*, written by JOINVILLE, p. 36.

The ſtate of literature or humanity.

V. Theſe public inſtitutions, conſecrated to the advancement of learning, were attended with remarkable ſucceſs; but that branch of erudition, which we call humanity, or polite literature, derived leſs advantage from them, than the other ſciences. The induſtrious youth either applied themſelves entirely to the ſtudy of the civil and canon laws, which was a ſure path to preferment, or employed their labours in philoſophical reſearches, in order to the attainment of a ſhining reputation, and of the applauſe that was laviſhed upon ſuch as were endowed with a ſubtile and metaphyſical genius. Hence the bitter complaints, that were made by the pontifs and other biſhops, of the neglect and decline of the liberal arts and ſciences; and hence alſo the zealous, but unſucceſsful efforts they uſed to turn the youth from juriſprudence and philoſophy, to the ſtudy of humanity and philology [h]. Notwithſtanding all this, the XIIIth century produced ſeveral writers, who were very far from being contemptible, ſuch as GUIL. BRITO [i], GUALTHERUS MAPES [k], MATTHEW of *Vendoſme*, ALAIN DE L'ISLE [l], GUNTHERUS, JACOBUS DE VITRIACO, and ſeveral others, who wrote with eaſe, and were not altogether deſtitute of elegance. Among the hiſtorians the firſt place is due to MATTHEW PARIS, a writer of the higheſt merit both in point of knowledge and prudence, to whom we may add RODERICUS XIMENIUS, RIGORDUS [m], VINCENT of *Beauvais*, ROBERT of *St. Marino* [n], MARTINUS, a native of *Poland*, GERVAIS of *Tilbury* [o], CONRAD of *Lichtenau*, GUILIELMUS NANGIUS, whoſe names are worthy of being preſerved from oblivion. The writers, who have laboured to tranſmit to poſterity the lives and exploits of the ſaints, have rather related the ſuperſtitions and miſeries of the times, than the actions of theſe holy men. Among theſe biographers, JAMES of *Vitri*, mentioned above, makes the greateſt figure; he alſo compoſed a *Hiſtory of the Lombards*, that is full of inſipid and trifling ſtories [p].

The ſtudy of the Greek and Oriental languages.

VI. ROGER BACON [q], JOHN BALBI, and ROBERT CAPITO, with ſome other learned men, whoſe number was but inconſiderable, applied themſelves to

---

[g] Beſides the writers abovementioned, ſee JO. CHR. ITTERUS, *De Gradibus Academicis.*—JUST. HENN. BÖHMERI *Præf. ad jus Canonicum*, p. 14.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 24.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 256. 682. 684, &c.

[h] BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 265. where there is an epiſtle of INNOCENT III, who ſeems to take this matter ſeriouſly to heart.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 124.—IMOLA *in Dantem in Muratorii Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1262.

[i] See the *Hiſtoire de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xvi. p. 255.

[k] JO. WOLFII *Lectiones Memorabil.* tom. i. p. 430.

[l] Called in Latin, ALANUS *De Inſulis.*

[m] *Hiſtoire de l'Acad. des Inſcript. et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xvi. p. 243. which alſo gives an ample account of WILLIAM of *Nangis*, p. 292.

[n] See LE BOEUF, *Memoires pour l'Hiſtoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 490. where there is alſo a learned account of VINCENT of *Beauvais*, p. 494.

[(o) JERVAIS of *Tilbury*, was nephew to HENRY II king of *England*, and was in high credit with the emperor OTHO IV, to whom he dedicated a Deſcription of the World and a Chronicle, both of which he had himſelf compoſed. He wrote alſo a Hiſtory of *England*, and one of the Holy Land, with ſeveral treatiſes upon different ſubjects.]

[p] See SCHELHORNII *Amœnitates Litterariæ*, tom. xi. p. 324.

[(q) This illuſtrious Franciſcan was, in point of genius and univerſal learning, one of the greateſt the ſtudy of Greek literature. The Hebrew language and theology were much leſs cultivated; though it appears that Bacon and Capito already mentioned, and Raymond Martin, author of an excellent treatiſe, entitled, *Pugio Fidei Chriſtianæ*, or, *The Dagger of the Chriſtian Faith*, were extremely well verſed in that ſpecies of *erudition*. Many of the Spaniards, and more particularly the Dominican friars, made themſelves maſters of the Arabian learning and language, as the kings of *Spain* had charged the latter with the inſtruction and converſion of the Jews and Saracens who reſided in their dominions [*r*]. As to the Latin grammarians, the beſt of them were extremely barbarous and inſipid, and equally deſtitute of taſte and knowledge. To be convinced of this, we have only to caſt an eye upon the productions of Alexander de Villa Dei, who was looked upon as the moſt eminent of them all, and whoſe works were red in almoſt all the ſchools from this period until the xvith century. This pedantic Franciſcan compoſed, in the year 1240, what he called, a *Doctrinale*, in *Leonine* verſe, full of the moſt wretched quibbles, and in which the rules of grammar and criticiſm are delivered with the greateſt confuſion and obſcurity, or rather, are covered with impenetrable darkneſs.

The ſtate of philoſophy.

VII. The various ſyſtems of philoſophy that were in vogue before this century, loſt their credit by degrees, and ſubmitted to the triumphant doctrine of Aristotle, which erected a new and deſpotic empire in the republic of letters, and reduced the whole ideal world under its lordly dominion. Several of the works of this philoſopher; and more eſpecially his metaphyſical productions, had been ſo early as the beginning of this century tranſlated into Latin at *Paris*, and were from that time explained to the youth in the public ſchools [*s*]. But when it appeared, that Almeric [*t*] had drawn from theſe books his erroneous ſentiments concerning the divine nature, they were prohibited and condemned as pernicious and peſtilential by

---

ornaments of the Britiſh nation, and in general of the republic of letters. The aſtoniſhing diſcoveries he made in aſtronomy, chemiſtry, optics, and mathematics, made him paſs for a magician in the ignorant and ſuperſtitious times in which he lived, while his profound knowledge in philoſophy, theology, and the Greek and Oriental languages, procured him, with more juſtice, the title of the *admirable*, or *wonderful doctor*. Among other diſcoveries, he is ſaid to have made that of the compoſition and force of gun-powder, which he deſcribes clearly in one of his letters; and he propoſed much the ſame correction of the Kalendar, which was executed about 300 years after by Gregory XIII. He compoſed a prodigious number of books, of which the liſt may be ſeen in the *General Dictionary*, at the article Bacon.]

[*r*] See Rich. Simon's *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iii. p. 112.—Nic. Antonii *Bibliotheca veter. Hiſpanica*.

[*s*] Franc. Patricii *Diſcuſſiones Peripateticæ*, tom. i. lib. xi. p. 145.—Jo. Launoius, *De varia Ariſtot. fortuna in Acad. Pariſienſi*, cap. i. p. 127. ed. *Elſwich*. It is commonly reported, that the books of Aristotle here mentioned were tranſlated from Arabic into Latin. But we are told poſitively, that theſe books were brought from *Conſtantinople*, and tranſlated from Greek into Latin. See Rigordus, *De geſtis Philippi regis Francorum, ad A.* 1209, in Andr. Chesnii *Scriptor. Hiſtor. Franc.* p. 119.

[(*t*) Almeric, or Amauri, does not ſeem to have entertained any enormous errors. He held, that every Chriſtian was obliged to believe himſelf a member of Jesus Christ, and attached, perhaps, ſome extravagant and fanatical ideas to that opinion; but his followers fell into more pernicious notions, and adopted the moſt odious tenets, maintaining, that the power of the Father continued no longer than the Moſaic diſpenſation; that the empire of the Son extended only to the xiiith century; and that then the reign of the Holy Ghoſt commenced, when all ſacraments and a public decree of the council of *Sens* in the year 1209 [u]. The logic of ARISTOTLE, however, recovered its credit ſome years after this, and was publicly taught, in the univerſity of *Paris* in the year 1215; but the natural philoſophy and metaphyſic of that great man were ſtill under the ſentence of condemnation [w]. It was reſerved for the emperor FREDERIC II, to reſtore the Stagirite to his former glory, which this prince effected by employing a number of learned men, whom he had choſen with the greateſt attention and care [x], and who were profoundly verſed in the knowledge of the languages, to tranſlate into Latin from the Greek and Arabic, certain books of ARISTOTLE, and of other ancient ſages. This tranſlation, which was recommended, in a particular manner, to the academy of *Bolonia* by the learned emperor, raiſed the credit of ARISTOTLE to the greateſt height, and gave him an irreſiſtible and deſpotic authority in all the European ſchools. This authority was ſtill farther augmented by the tranſlations, which were made of ſome of the books of the Grecian ſage by ſeveral Latin interpreters, ſuch as MICHAEL SCOT, PHILIP of *Tripoly*, WILLIAM FLEMING, and others; though theſe men were quite unequal to the taſk they undertook, and had neither ſuch knowledge of the languages, nor ſuch an acquaintance with philoſophy, as were neceſſary to the ſucceſsful execution of ſuch a difficult enterprize [y].

Thomas Aquinas and others adopt and maintain the Ariſtotelian ſyſtem.

VIII. The Ariſtotelian philoſophy received the very laſt addition that could be made to its authority and luſtre, when the Dominican and Franciſcan friars adopted its tenets, taught it in their ſchools, and illuſtrated it in their writings. Theſe two mendicant orders were looked upon as the chief depoſitaries of all learning both human and divine, and were followed, with the utmoſt eagerneſs and aſſiduity, by all ſuch as were ambitious of being diſtinguiſhed from the multitude by their ſuperior knowledge. ALEXANDER

---

external worſhip were to be aboliſhed, and the ſalvation of Chriſtians was to be accompliſhed merely by internal acts of illuminating grace. Their morals alſo were as infamous, as their doctrine was abſurd, and under the name of charity they comprehended and committed the moſt criminal acts of impurity and licentiouſneſs.]

[(u) Dr. MOSHEIM has fallen here into two light miſtakes. It was at *Paris*, and not at *Sens*, and in the year 1210, and not in 1209, that the metaphyſical books of ARISTOTLE were condemned to the flames. The writers quoted here by our author are LAUNOIUS, *De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna in Acad. Pariſ.* cap. iv. p. 195. and the ſame writer's *Syllabus rationum quibus Durandi cauſa defenditur*, tom. i. Opp. part. I. p. 8.]

[w] NAT. ALEXANDER, *Select. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Capita*, tom. viii. cap. iii. § 7. p. 76.

[x] PETR. DE VINEIS *Epiſtolar. Lib.* iii. *Ep.* lxvii. p. 503. This epiſtle is addreſſed *ad magiſtros et ſcholares Bononienſes*, i. e. to *the maſters and ſcholars of the academy of Bolonia*; but it is more than probable, that the emperor ſent letters, upon this occaſion, to the other European ſchools. It is a common opinion, that this learned prince had all the works of ARISTOTLE, that were then extant, tranſlated into Latin about the year 1220, but this cannot be deduced from the letter abovementioned, nor from any other ſufficient teſtimony that we know of.

[y] See WOOD's account of the interpreters of ARISTOTLE, in his *Antiquitat. Oxon.* tom i. p 119. as alſo JEBB's *Preface* to the *Opus Majus* of the famous ROGER BACON, publiſhed at *London* in folio, in the year 1733. We ſhall give here the opinion, which BACON had of the tranſlators of ARISTOTLE, in the words of that great man, who expreſſes his contempt of theſe wretched interpreters in the following manner: *Si haberem* (ſays he) *poteſtatem ſupra libros Ariſtotelis Latine converſos, ego facerem omnes cremari, quia non eſt niſi temporis amiſſio ſtudere in illis, et cauſa erroris et multiplicatio ignorantiæ, ultra id quod valeat explicari.*

Hales, an Engliſh Franciſcan, who taught philoſophy at *Paris*, and acquired, by the ſtrength of his metaphyſical genius, the title of the Irrefragable *Doctor* [z], and Albert the Great, a German, of the Dominican order, and biſhop of *Ratiſbon*, a man of vaſt abilities and a univerſal dictator at this time [a], were the two firſt eminent writers who illuſtrated, in their learned productions, the Ariſtotelian ſyſtem. But it was the diſciple of Albert, Thomas Aquinas, the *Angelic Doctor*, and the great luminary of the ſcholaſtic world, that contributed moſt to the glory of the Stagirite [b], by inculcating, illuſtrating, and enforcing his doctrines, both in his lectures and in his writings, and, principally, by engaging one of his learned collegues to give, under his inſpection, a new tranſlation of the works of the Grecian ſage, which far ſurpaſſed the former verſion in exactneſs, perſpicuity, and elegance [c]. By theſe means the philoſophy of Aristotle, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of ſeveral divines, and even of the Roman pontifs themſelves, who beheld its progreſs with an unfriendly eye, triumphed in all the Latin ſchools, and abſorbed all the other ſyſtems that had flouriſhed before this literary revolution.

The limits of ſcience are extended by ſeveral eminent men.

IX. There were, however, at this time in *Europe* ſeveral perſons of ſuperior genius and penetration, who, notwithſtanding their veneration for Aristotle, thought the method of treating philoſophy, which his writings had introduced, dry, inelegant, and proper to confine and damp the efforts of the mind in the purſuit of truth, and who, conſequently, were deſirous of enlarging the ſphere of ſcience by new reſearches and new diſcoveries [d].

---

[z] See Lucæ Waddingi *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 233.—Du Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 200. 673.

[a] Jo. Alb. Fabricii *Bibliotheca Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 113.

[b] The Dominicans maintain, that this *Angelic Doctor* was the diſciple of Albert the Great, and their opinion ſeems to be founded in truth. See Antoine Touron, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 99. The Franciſcans, however, maintain as obſtinately, that Alexander Hales was the maſter of Thomas. See Waddingi *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 133.

[c] It has been believed by many, that William de Moerbeka, a native of Flanders, of the Dominican order, and archbiſhop of *Corinth*, was the author of the new Latin tranſlation of the Works of Aristotle, which was carried on and finiſhed under the auſpicious inſpection of Thomas Aquinas. See J. Echard *Scriptores Dominican.* tom. i. p. 338.—Casim. Oudinus, *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. iii. p. 468.—Jo. Franc. Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, tom. i. p. 416. Others however ſuppoſe, though indeed with leſs evidence, that this tranſlation was compoſed by Henry Kosbein, who was alſo a Dominican. See Echard *Script. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 469.

[d] Bacon's contempt of the learning that was in vogue in his time may be ſeen in the following paſſage quoted by Jebb, in his *Preface* to the *Opus Majus* of that great man. *Nunquam*, ſays he, *fuit tanta apparentia ſapientiæ, nec tantum exercitium ſtudii in tot facultatibus, in tot regionibus, ſicut jam a quadraginta annis; ubique enim doctores ſunt diſperſi . . . in omni civitate, et in omni caſtro, et in omni burgo, præcipue per duos ordines ſtudentes* (he means the Franciſcans and Dominicans, who were almoſt the only religious orders, that diſtinguiſhed themſelves by an application to ſtudy) *quod non accidit, niſi a quadraginta annis aut circiter, cum tamen nunquam fuit* TANTA IGNORANTIA, TANTUS ERROR . . . *Vulgus ſtudentium languet et aſininat circa male tranſlata* (by theſe wretched verſions he underſtands the works of Aristotle, which were moſt miſerably tranſlated by ignorant bunglers) *et tempus et ſtudium amittit in omnibus et expenſas. Apparentia quidem ſola tenet eos, et non curant quid ſciant, ſed quid videantur ſcire coram multitudine inſenſata.* Thus, according to Bacon, in the midſt of the moſt ſpecious appearance of ſcience, the greateſt ignorance, and the groſſeſt errors reigned almoſt univerſally.

At the head of theſe noble adventurers we may juſtly place ROGER BACON, a Franciſcan friar, of the Engliſh nation, known by the appellation of the *admirable doctor*, renowned on account of his moſt important diſcoveries, and who, in the progreſs he had made in natural philoſophy, mathematics, chemiſtry, the mechanic arts, and the learned languages, ſoared far beyond the genius of the times [e]. With him we may aſſociate ARNOLD of *Villa nova*, whoſe place of nativity is fixed by ſome in *France*, by others in *Spain*, and who acquired a ſhining reputation by his knowledge in chemiſtry, poetry, philoſophy, languages, and phyſic [f]; as alſo PETRUS DE ABANO, a phyſician of *Padua*, who was ſurnamed the *Reconciler*, from a book he wrote with a deſign to terminate the diſſenſions and conteſts that reigned among the philoſophers and phyſicians [g], and who was profoundly verſed in the ſciences of philoſophy, aſtronomy, phyſic, and mathematics [h]. It muſt, however, be obſerved to the eternal diſhonour of the age, that the only fruits, which theſe great men enjoyed of their learned labours, and their noble, as well as ſucceſsful, efforts for the advancement of the arts and ſciences, were the furious clamours of an enraged and ſuperſtitious multitude, who looked upon them as heretics and magicians, and thirſted ſo eagerly after their blood, that they eſcaped, with difficulty, the hands of the public executioner. BACON was confined many years to a loathſome priſon, and the other two were, after their death, brought before the tribunal of the inquiſition, and declared worthy of being committed to the flames for the novelties they had introduced into the republic of letters.

The ſtudy of law and phyſic.

X. The ſtate of theology, and the method of teaching and repreſenting the doctrines of Chriſtianity that now prevailed, ſhall be mentioned in their place. The civil and canon laws held the firſt rank in the circle of the ſciences, and were ſtudied with a peculiar zeal and application by almoſt all who were ambitious of literary glory. Theſe ſciences, however, notwithſtanding the aſſiduity with which they were cultivated, were far from being, as yet, brought to any tolerable degree of perfection. They were disfigured by the jargon that reigned in the ſchools, and they were corrupted and rendered intricate by a multitude of trivial commentaries that were deſigned to illuſtrate and explain them. Some employed their labours in collecting the letters of the Roman pontifs, which are commonly known under the title of *Decretals* [i], and which were looked upon as a very important branch of eccleſiaſtical law. Raimond of *Pennafort*, a native of *Barcelona*, was the moſt famous of all theſe compilers, and acquired a conſiderable reputation by his collection of the Decretals in five books, which he undertook at the deſire of Gregory IX, and which has been ſince honoured with the name of that pontif, who ordered it to be added to the Decretals of Gratian, and to be red in all the European colleges [k]. Towards the concluſion of this century, Boniface VIII had a new collection made, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of Decretals*, becauſe it was added to the five already mentioned.

---

[e] That BACON deſerves this high rank in the learned world appears evidently from his book, entitled, *Opus Majus*, which was dedicated to the Roman pontif CLEMENS IV, and which Doctor JEBB publiſhed at *London* in 1733, from a manuſcript which ſtill exiſts in the univerſity of *Dublin*, enriching it with a learned Preface and a conſiderable number of judicious obſervations. The other works of BACON, which are very numerous, lie as yet for the moſt part concealed in the libraries of the curious. For a farther account of this eminent man, ſee WOOD *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 136.—WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 264. tom. v. p. 51.—THOM. GALE *ad Jamblichum de Myſteriis Ægyptior.* p. 235. *General Hiſt. and Crit. Dictionary*, at the article BACON.

[f] See NIC. ANTONII *Biblioth. vetus Hiſpan.* tom. ii. lib. ix. c. i. p. 74—PIERRE JOSEPH, *Vie d'Arnaud de Ville neuve*, Aix 1719.—NICERON, *Memoires des hommes illuſtres*, tom. xxxiv. p. 82.—NICOL. EYMERICI *Directorium Inquiſitorum*, p. 282. where among other things we have an account of his errors.

[g] This book was entitled, *Conciliator Differentiarum Philoſophorum et Medicorum*.

[h] There is a very accurate account of this philoſopher given by JOH. MARIA MAZZUCHELLI *Notizie Storiche e Critiche intorno alla vita di Pietro d'Abano*, in ANGELI CALOGERÆ *Opuſculi Scientifici et Philologici*, tom. xxiii. p. 1.—liv.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The corruption of the clergy.

I. BOTH the Greek and Latin writers, provoked, beyond meaſure, by the flagitious lives of their ſpiritual rulers and inſtructors, complain loudly of their licentious manners, and load them with the ſevereſt reproaches; nor will theſe complaints and reproaches appear exceſſive to ſuch as are acquainted with the hiſtory of this corrupt and ſuperſtitious age [l]. Several eminent men attempted to ſtem this torrent of licentiouſneſs, which from the heads of the church had carried its pernicious ſtreams through all the members; but their power and influence were unequal to ſuch a difficult and arduous enterprize. The Grecian emperors were prevented from executing any project of this kind by the infelicity of the times, and the various calamities and tumults that not only reigned in their dominions, but even ſhook the throne on which they ſat; while the power and opulence of the Roman pontifs and the ſuperſtition of the age hindered the Latins from accompliſhing, or even attempting a reformation in the church.

And of the Roman pontifs.

II. The hiſtory of the popes preſents a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that diſhonoured the miniſters of the church, who were peculiarly obliged, by their ſacred office, to exhibit to the world diſtinguiſhed models of piety and virtue. Such of the Sacerdotal order, as were advanced to places of authority in the church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and ſhewed manifeſtly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an abſolute and unlimited dominion. The popes, more eſpecially, inculcated that pernicious maxim, "That the biſhop of *Rome* is the ſupreme lord of the univerſe, and that neither princes nor biſhops, civil governors, nor eccleſiaſtical rulers, have any lawful power in church or ſtate but what they derive from him." This abominable maxim, which was conſidered as the ſum and ſubſtance of papal juriſprudence, the Roman pontifs maintained obſtinately, and left no means unemployed, that perfidy or violence could ſuggeſt, to give it the force of a univerſal law. It was in conſequence of this arrogant pretenſion, that they not only claimed the right of diſpoſing of eccleſiaſtical *benefices*, as they are commonly called, but alſo of conferring civil dominion and of dethroning kings and emperors according to their good pleaſure. It is true, this maxim was far from being univerſally adopted; many placed the authority of councils above that of the pontifs, and ſuch of the European kings and princes as were not ingloriouſly blinded, and enſlaved by the ſuperſtition of the times, aſſerted their rights with dignity and ſucceſs, excluded the pontifs from all concern in their civil tranſactions, nay, even reſerved to themſelves the ſupremacy over the churches that were eſtabliſhed in their dominions [*m*]. In oppoſing thus the haughty pretenſions of the lordly pontifs, it was, indeed, neceſſary to proceed with mildneſs, caution, and prudence, on account of the influence which theſe ſpiritual tyrants had uſurped over the minds of the people, and the power they had of alarming princes, by exciting their ſubjects to rebellion.

---

[i] See Boulay, *Hiſt. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 98.

[k] Gerh. a Mastricht, *Hiſtoria juris Eccleſiaſtici*, § 353. p. 384.—Jo. Chiflet. *De juris utriuſque Architectis*, cap. vi. p. 60.—Echard et Quetif, *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 106.—*Acta Sanctor. Antwerp.* tom. i. *Januarii ad d.* vii. p. 404.

[l] See the remarkable letter of the Roman pontif Gregory IX to the archbiſhop of *Bourges*, which was written in the year 1227, with a deſign to reprove and reform the vices which had infeſted all the various orders of the clergy, and which is publiſhed by Dion. Sammarthanus, in his *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. *in Append.* p. 21.—See alſo Du Fresne, *Adnotat. in Vitam Ludovici Sti.* p. 99.

The power of creating biſhops, abbots, &c. claimed by the pontifs.

III. In order to eſtabliſh their authority, both in civil and eccleſiaſtical matters, upon the firmeſt foundations, the Roman pontifs aſſumed to themſelves the power of diſpoſing of the various offices of the church, whether of a higher or more ſubordinate nature, and of creating *biſhops*, *abbots*, and *canons* according to their fancy. Thus we ſee the ghoſtly heads of the church, who formerly diſputed with ſuch ardor againſt the emperors in favour of the free election of biſhops and abbots, overturning now all the laws that related to the election of theſe ſpiritual rulers, reſerving for themſelves the revenues of the richeſt benefices, conferring vacant places upon their clients and their creatures, nay, often depoſing biſhops that had been duly and lawfully elected, and ſubſtituting, with a high hand, others in their room [*n*]. The hypocritical pretexts for all theſe arbitrary proceedings were an ardent zeal for the welfare of the church, and an anxious concern, leſt devouring *heretics* ſhould get a footing among the flock of CHRIST [*o*]. The firſt of the pontifs, who uſurped ſuch an extravagant extent of authority, was INNOCENT III, whoſe example was followed by HONORIUS III, GREGORY IX, and ſeveral of their ſucceſſors. But it was keenly oppoſed by the biſhops, who had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of nominating to the ſmaller benefices, and, ſtill more effectually, by the kings of *England* and *France*, who employed the force of warm remonſtrances and vigorous edicts to ſtop the progreſs of this new jurisprudence [p]. LEWIS IX, king of *France*, and now the tutelar ſaint of that nation, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the noble oppoſition he made to theſe papal encroachments. In the year 1268, before he ſet out for the Holy Land, he ſecured the rights of the Gallican church againſt the inſidious attempts of the Roman pontifs by that famous edict known in *France* by the name of the *pragmatic ſanction* [q]. This reſolute and prudent meaſure rendered the pontifs more cautious, and ſlow in their proceedings, but did not terrify them from the proſecution of their purpoſe. For BONIFACE VIII maintained, in the moſt expreſs and impudent terms, that the univerſal church was under the dominion of the pontifs, and that princes and lay-patrons, councils and chapters had no more power in ſpiritual things, than what they derived from CHRIST's vicar upon earth.

[*m*] As a ſpecimen of this the reader may peruſe the letters of INNOCENT III, and the emperor OTHO IV, which have been collected by the learned GEORGE CHRIST. GEBAUER, in his *Hiſtory of the Emperor* RICHARD, written in German, p. 611—614. Other princes, and more eſpecially the kings of *England* and *France* diſplayed, in the defence of their rights and privileges, the ſame zeal that animated OTHO.

[*n*] Many examples of this may be taken from the hiſtory of this century. See STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. vii. p. 443. 466. 470. 488. 491. 493.—*Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 69. *Append.*—LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor. in Diplomat.*—WOOD *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 148. 201. 202.

[*o*] See the *Epiſtle of* INNOCENT IV, in BALUZ. *Miſcellan.* tom. vii. p. 468.

The authority of the pope's legates.

IV. The legates, whom the pontifs ſent into the provinces to repreſent their perſons, and execute their orders, imitated perfectly the avarice and inſolence of their maſters. They violated the privileges of the chapters; diſpoſed of the ſmaller, and ſometimes of the more important eccleſiaſtical benefices, in favour of ſuch as had gained them by bribes, or ſuch like conſiderations [r]; extorted money from the people by the vileſt and moſt iniquitous means; ſeduced the unwary by forged letters and other ſtratagems of that nature; excited tumults among the multitude, and were, themſelves, the ring-leaders of the moſt furious and rebellious factions; carried on, in the moſt ſcandalous manner, the impious traffic of *relicks* and *indulgences*, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves by ſeveral acts of profligacy ſtill more heinous than the practices now mentioned. Hence we find the writers of this age complaining unanimouſly of the flagitious conduct and the enormous crimes of the pope's legates [s]. Nay, we ſee the Roman pontif ALEXANDER IV, enacting, in the year 1256, a ſevere law againſt the avarice and frauds of theſe corrupt miniſters [t], which, however, they eaſily evaded by their friends and their credit at the court of *Rome*.

The wealth and revenues of the pontif. augmented.

V. From the IXth century to this period the wealth and revenues of the pontifs had not received any conſiderable augmentation; but at this time they were vaſtly increaſed under INNOCENT III and NICOLAS III, partly by the events of war, and partly by the munificence of kings and emperors. INNOCENT was no ſooner ſeated in the papal chair, than he reduced under his juriſdiction the prefect of *Rome*, who had hitherto been conſidered as ſubject to the emperor, to whom he was bound by the oath of allegiance, he took to that prince in entring upon his office. He alſo ſeized upon *Ancona*, *Spoletto*, *Aſſiſi*, and ſeveral cities and fortreſſes which had, according to him, been unjuſtly alienated from the patrimony of St. PETER [u]. On the other hand, FREDERIC II, who was extremely deſirous that the pope ſhould eſpouſe his quarrel with OTHO IV, loaded the Roman ſee with the richeſt marks of his munificence and liberality, and not only made a noble preſent in valuable lands to the popes brother [w], but alſo permitted RICHARD, count of *Fundi* to leave, by will, all his poſſeſſions to the Roman ſee [x], and confirmed the immenſe donation that had formerly been made to it by the opulent MATILDA. Such was the progreſs that INNOCENT III made, during his pontificate, in augmenting the ſplendor and wealth of the church. NICOLAS IV followed his example with the warmeſt emulation, and, in the year 1278, gave a remarkable proof of his arrogance and obſtinacy in refuſing to crown the emperor RODOLPHUS I, before he had acknowledged and confirmed, by a ſolemn treaty, all the pretenſions of the Roman ſee, of which, if ſome were plauſible, the greateſt part were altogether groundleſs, or, at leaſt, extremely dubious. This agreement, to which all the Italian princes, that were ſubject to the emperor, were obliged to accede, was no ſooner concluded, than NICOLAS reduced under his temporal dominion ſeveral cities, and territories in *Italy* that had formerly been annexed to the imperial crown, particularly *Romania* and *Bologna*. It was therefore under theſe two pontifs, that the ſee of *Rome* arrived, partly by force, and partly by artifice, at that high degree of grandeur and opulence, which it yet maintains in our times [y].

---

[p] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 659. and principally tom. iv. p. 9·1.

[q] Idem, ib. p. 389.

[r] See BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. vii. p. 437. 475. 480, &c.

[s] See that judicious and excellent writer MATTH. PARIS, in his *Hiſtoria Major*, p. 3·3. 316. 549. and particularly p. 637, where we find the following remarkable words: *Semper ſolent legati quales quales, et omnes nuncii papales regna quæ ingrediuntur depauperare, vel aliquo modo perturbare.* See alſo BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom iii. p. 659.

[t] This edict is publiſhed by LAMI, in his *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, tom. ii. p. 300.

The tyrannic pontificate of Innocent III, proved by ſeveral examples.

VI. INNOCENT III, who remained at the head of the church until the year 1216, followed the ſteps of GREGORY VII, and not only uſurped the deſpotic government of the church, but alſo claimed the empire of the world, and thought of nothing leſs than ſubjecting the kings and princes of the earth to his lordly ſcepter. He was a man of learning and application, but his cruelty, avarice, and arrogance [z] clouded the luſtre of any good qualities, which his panegyriſts have thought proper to attribute to him. In *Aſia* and *Europe* he diſpoſed of crowns and ſcepters with the moſt wanton ambition. In *Aſia* he gave a king to the Armenians: in *Europe* he uſurped the ſame extravagant privilege in the year 1204, and conferred the regal dignity upon PRIMISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia* [a]. The ſame year he ſent to JOHANNICIUS, duke of *Bulgaria* and *Walachia*, an extraordinary legate, who, in the name of the pontif, inveſted that prince with the enſigns and honours of royalty, while, with his own hand, he crowned Peter II of *Arragon*, who had rendered his dominions ſubject and tributary to the church, and ſaluted him publicly at *Rome* with the title of King [*b*]. We omit many other examples of this frenetic pretenſion to univerſal empire, which might be produced from the *letters* of this arrogant pontif, and many other acts of deſpotiſm, which *Europe* beheld with aſtoniſhment, but alſo, to its eternal reproach, with the ignominious ſilence of a paſſive obedience.

---

[u] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. iii. p. 161.—MURATORII *Antiq. Italicæ*, tom. i. p. 328.

[w] This brother of the pontif was called RICHARD. See for an account of this tranſaction MURATORI's *Antiquitat. Italicæ*, tom. v. p. 652.

[x] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad A.* 1212. § ii.

[y] See RAYNALDUS, *loc. cit. ad A.* 1278. § xlvii.

[z] See MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 206. 230.

[(a) Other hiſtorians affirm, that it was the emperor PHILIP that conferred the royal dignity upon PRIMISLAUS, in order to ſtrengthen his party againſt OTHO.]

VII. The ambition of this pope was not ſatisfied with the diſtribution and government of theſe petty kingdoms. He extended his views farther, and reſolved to render the power and majeſty of the Roman ſee formidable to the greateſt European monarchs, and even to the emperors themſelves. When the empire of *Germany* was diſputed, towards the commencement of this century, between Philip, duke of *Swabia*, and Otho IV, third ſon of Henry Lion, he eſpouſed, at firſt, the cauſe of Otho, thundered out his excommunications againſt Philip, and upon the death of the latter, which happened in the year 1209, he placed the imperial diadem upon the head of his adverſary. But as Otho was, by no means, diſpoſed to ſubmit to this pontif's nod, or to ſatisfy, to the full, his ambitious deſires, he incurred, of conſequence, his lordly indignation, and Innocent, declaring him, by a ſolemn excommunication, unworthy of the empire, raiſed in his place Frederic II his pupil, the ſon of Henry VI, and king of the two *Sicilies*, to the imperial throne in the year 1712 [*c*]. The ſame pontif excommunicated Philip Augustus, king of *France*, for having diſſolved his marriage with Ingerburg, a princeſs of *Denmark*, and eſpouſed another in her place; nor did he ceaſe to purſue this monarch with his anathemas, until he engaged him to receive the divorced queen, and to reſtore her to her loſt dignity [*d*].

VIII. But of all the European princes none felt, in ſo diſhonourable and ſevere a manner, the deſpotic fury of this inſolent pontif as John, ſurnamed *Sans terre*, king of *England*. This prince oppoſed vigorouſly the meaſures of Innocent, who had ordered the monks of *Canterbury* to chuſe Stephen Langton, a Roman cardinal of Engliſh deſcent, archbiſhop of that ſee, notwithſtanding the election of John de Grey to that high dignity which had been regularly made by the convent, and had been confirmed by royal authority [*e*]. The pope, after having conſecrated Langton at *Viterbo*, wrote a ſoothing letter in his favour, to the king, accompanied with four rings, and a myſtical comment upon the precious ſtones with which they were enriched. But this preſent was not ſufficient to avert the juſt indignation of the offending monarch, who ſent a body of troops to drive out of the kingdom the monks of *Canterbury*, who had been engaged by the pope's menaces to receive LANGTON as their arch-biſhop. The king alſo declared to the pontif, that, if he perſiſted in impoſing a prelate upon the ſee of *Canterbury* in oppoſition to a regular election already made, the conſequences of ſuch preſumptuous obſtinacy would, in the iſſue, prove fatal to the papal authority in *England*. INNOCENT was ſo far from being terrified by this menacing remonſtrance, that, in the year 1208, he ſent orders to the biſhop of *London*, *Worceſter*, and *Ely* to lay the kingdom under an *interdict*, in caſe the monarch refuſed to yield and to receive LANGTON. JOHN, alarmed at this terrible menace, and unwilling to break entirely with the pope, declared his readineſs to confirm the election made at *Rome*; but in the act that was drawn up for this purpoſe, he wiſely threw in a clauſe to prevent any interpretation of this compliance, that might be prejudicial to his rights, dignity, and prerogative. This exception was rejected, and the *interdict* was proclaimed. A ſtop was immediately put to divine ſervice; the churches were ſhut; the adminiſtration of all the ſacraments was ſuſpended except that of baptiſm; the dead were buried in the high-ways without the uſual rites or any funeral ſolemnity. But notwithſtanding this interdict, the Ciſtertian order continued to perform divine ſervice, and ſeveral learned and reſpectable divines, among which were the biſhops of *Wincheſter* and *Norwich*, proteſted againſt the injuſtice of the pope's proceedings.

[*b*] Muratorii *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 116.—Jo. de Ferrera, *Hiſtoire d'Eſpagne*, tom. iv. p. 8.

[*c*] All this is amply illuſtrated in the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. iii. lib. vii. p. 247.

[*d*] Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 8.—Daniel, *Hiſtoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 475.—Gerhard. du Bois, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 204—257.

[(*e*) Dr. Mosheim paſſes lightly over this rupture between king John and Innocent III, mentioning in a few lines the interdict under which *England* was laid by that pontif, the excommunication he iſſued out againſt the king's perſon, and the impious act by which he abſolved the Engliſh for their allegiance. The tranſlator, however, thought this event of too great importance to be treated with ſuch brevity, and has, therefore, taken the liberty to enlarge conſiderably this VIIIth ſection, which contains but eleven lines in the original.]

The interdict not producing the effects that were expected from it, the pontif proceeded to a ſtill farther degree of ſeverity and preſumption, and denounced a ſentence of excommunication againſt the perſon of the Engliſh monarch. This ſentence, which was iſſued out in the year 1208, was followed about three years after by a bull, abſolving all his ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, and ordering all perſons to avoid him, on pain of excommunication. But it was in the year 1212, that INNOCENT carried his impious tyranny to the moſt enormous length, when, aſſembling a council of cardinals and prelates, he depoſed JOHN, declared the throne of *England* vacant, and wrote to PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of *France*, to execute this ſentence, to undertake the conqueſt of *England*, and to unite that kingdom to his dominions for ever. He, at the ſame time, publiſhed another bull, exhorting all Chriſtian princes to contribute, whatever was in their power, to the ſucceſs of this expedition, promiſing ſuch as ſeconded PHILIP in this grand enterprize the ſame indulgences that were granted to thoſe who carried arms againſt the infidels in *Paleſtine*. The French monarch entered into the views of the Roman pontif, and made immenſe preparations for the invaſion of *England*. The king of *England*, on the other hand, aſſembled his forces, and was putting himſelf in a poſture of defence, when PANDULF, the pope's legate, arrived at *Dover*, and propoſed a conference in order to prevent the approaching rupture, and to conjure the ſtorm. This artful legate terrified the king, who met him at that place, with an exaggerated account of the armament of PHILIP on the one hand, and of the diſaffection of the Engliſh on the other; and perſuaded him that there was no poſſible way left of ſaving his dominions from the formidable arms of the French king, but that of putting them under the protection of the Roman ſee. JOHN, finding himſelf in ſuch a perplexing ſituation, and full of diffidence both in the nobles of his court and in the officers of his army, complied with this diſhonourable propoſal, did homage to INNOCENT, reſigned his crown to the legate, and received it again as a preſent from the ſee of *Rome*, to which he rendered his kingdoms tributary, and ſwore fealty as a vaſſal and feudatory [*f*]. In the act by which he reſigned, thus ſcandalouſly, his kingdoms to the papal juriſdiction, he declared that he had neither been compelled to this meaſure by fear nor by force, but that it was his own voluntary deed, performed by the advice, and with the conſent of the barons of his kingdom. He obliged himſelf and his heirs to pay an annual ſum of ſeven hundred marks for *England*, and three hundred for *Ireland*, in acknowledgement of the pope's ſupremacy and juriſdiction, and conſented that he or ſuch of his ſucceſſors as ſhould refuſe to pay the ſubmiſſion, now ſtipulated, to the ſee of *Rome*, ſhould forfeit all their right to the Britiſh crown [*g*]. " This ſhameful " ceremony was performed, ſays a modern hiſtorian [*h*], on Aſcenſion day in " the houſe of the Templars at *Dover*, in the midſt of a great concourſe of " people, who beheld it with confuſion and indignation. JOHN, in doing " homage to the pope, preſented a ſum of money to his repreſentative, " which the proud legate trampled under his feet, as a mark of the king's " dependence. Every ſpectator glowed with reſentment, and the arch-" biſhop of *Dublin* exclaimed aloud againſt ſuch intolerable inſolence. " PANDULF, not ſatisfied with this mortifying act of ſuperiority, kept the " crown and ſcepter five whole days, and then reſtored them as a ſpecial " favour of the Roman ſee. JOHN was deſpiſed before this extraordinary " reſignation; but now he was looked upon as a contemptible wretch, un-" worthy to ſit upon a throne: while he himſelf ſeemed altogether inſenſible " of his diſgrace."

Honorius III.

IX. INNOCENT III was ſucceeded in the pontificate by CONCIO SAVELLI, who aſſumed the title of HONORIUS III, ruled the church above ten years, and whoſe government, though not ſignalized by ſuch audacious exploits as thoſe of his predeceſſor, diſcovered, nevertheleſs, an ardent zeal for maintaining the pretenſions, and ſupporting the deſpotiſm of the Roman ſee. It was, in conſequence of this zeal, that the new pontif oppoſed the meaſures, and drew upon him the indignation of FREDERIC II, that magnanimous prince, on whoſe head he himſelf had placed, in the year 1220, the imperial crown. This ſpirited prince, following the ſteps of his illuſtrious grandfather, had formed the reſolution of confirming the authority and extending the juriſdiction of the emperors in *Italy*, of depreſſing the ſmall ſtates of *Lombardy*, and reducing to narrower limits the immenſe credit and opulence of the pontifs and biſhops; and it was with a view to the execution of theſe grand projects, that he deferred the fulfilling of the ſolemn vow, by which he had engaged himſelf to march a formidable army againſt the infidels in *Paleſtine*. The pontif, on the other hand, urged, with importunity, the emperor's departure, encouraged, animated, and ſtrengthened, by ſecret ſuccours, the Italian ſtates that oppoſed his pretenſions, and reſiſted the progreſs of his power by all the obſtacles which the moſt fertile invention could ſuggeſt. Theſe conteſts, however, had not, as yet, brought on an open rupture.

[*f*] For a full account of this ſhameful ceremony, ſee MATTHEW PARIS, *Hiſtoria Major*, p. 189. 192. 195.—As alſo BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 67.—RAPIN THOYRAS, *Hiſtoire d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 304.

[(*g*) *Cadet a jure regni*, is the expreſſion uſed in the *Charter of reſignation*, which may be ſeen at length in the *Hiſt. Major* of MATTHEW PARIS.]

[(*h*) See the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, by Dr. SMOLLET, vol. i. p. 437.]

The calamities that aroſe from the ambition of Gregory IX.

X. In the year 1227, HUGOLINUS, biſhop of *Oſtia*, whoſe advanced age had not extinguiſhed the fire of his ambition, nor diminiſhed the firmneſs and obſtinacy of his ſpirit, was raiſed to the pontificate, aſſumed the title of GREGORY IX, and kindled the feuds and diſſenſions, that had already ſecretly ſubſiſted between the church and the empire, into an open and violent flame. No ſooner was he placed in the papal chair, than, contrary to all juſtice and order, he excommunicated the emperor for putting off his expedition againſt the Saracens another year, though that delay was manifeſtly owing to a fit of ſickneſs, which ſeized that prince when he was ready to embark for *Paleſtine*. In the year 1228, FREDERIC, at laſt ſet out, arrived in the Holy Land; but, inſtead of carrying on the war with vigour, as we have had already occaſion to obſerve, he entered into a truce with SALADIN, and contented himſelf with the recovery of *Jeruſalem*. The pretended vicar of CHRIST, forgetting (or rather unwilling to perſuade himſelf) that his maſter's *kingdom was not of this world*, made war upon the emperor in *Apuglia* during his abſence [*i*], and uſed his utmoſt efforts to arm againſt him all the European powers. FREDERIC, having received information of theſe perfidious and violent proceedings, returned into *Europe* in the year 1229, defeated the papal army, retook the places he had loſt in *Sicily* and in *Italy*, and the year following made his peace with the pontif from whom he received a public and ſolemn abſolution. This peace, however, was but of a ſhort duration; nor was it poſſible for the emperor to bear the inſolent proceedings, and the imperious temper of GREGORY. He therefore broke all meaſures with that head-ſtrong pontif, diſtreſſed the ſtates of *Lombardy* that were in alliance with the ſee of *Rome*, ſeized upon the iſland of *Sardinia*, which GREGORY looked upon as a part of his ſpiritual patrimony, and erected it into a kingdom for his ſon ENTIUS. Theſe, with other ſteps that were equally provoking to the avarice and ambition of GREGORY, drew the thunder of the vatican anew upon the emperor's head in the year 1239. FREDERIC was excommunicated publicly with all the circumſtances of ſeverity that vindictive rage could invent, and was charged with the moſt flagitious

---

[(*i*) Under the feeble reign of HENRY III, the pope drew immenſe ſums out of *England* for the ſupport of this impious war, and carried his audacious avarice ſo far, as to demand the fifth part of the eccleſiaſtical revenues of the whole kingdom.]

crimes, and the moſt impious blaſphemies by the exaſperated pontif, who ſent a copy of this terrible accuſation to all the courts of *Europe*. The emperor, on the other hand, defended his injured reputation by ſolemn declarations in writing, while, by his victorious arms, he avenged himſelf of his adverſaries, maintained his ground, and reduced the pontif to the greateſt ſtraits. To get rid of theſe difficulties, the latter convened, in the year 1240, a general council at *Rome*, with a view to depoſe FREDERIC by the unanimous ſuffrages of the cardinals and prelates, that were to compoſe that aſſembly. But the emperor diſconcerted that audacious project by defeating, in the year 1241, a Genoeſe fleet, on board of which the greateſt part of theſe prelates were embarked, and by ſeizing, with all their treaſures, theſe reverend fathers, who were all committed to cloſe confinement. This diſappointment, attended with others which gave an unhappy turn to his affairs, and blaſted his moſt promiſing expectations, dejected and conſumed the deſpairing pontif, and contributed probably to the concluſion of his days, which happened ſoon after this remarkable event [k].

Innocent IV.

XI. GEOFFRY, biſhop of *Milan*, who ſucceeded GREGORY IX, under the title of CELESTINE IV, died before his conſecration, and, after a vacancy of twenty months, the apoſtolic ſtool was filled by SINIBALD, one of the counts of *Fieſque*, who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1243, aſſumed the denomination of INNOCENT IV, and yielded to none of his predeceſſors in arrogance and fury [l]. His elevation, however, offered at firſt a proſpect of peace, as he had formerly been attached to the intereſts of the emperor, and accordingly the conferences were opened, and a reconciliation was propoſed; but the terms offered by the new pope were too imperious and extravagant, not to be rejected with indignation by the emperor [m]. Hence it was that INNOCENT, not thinking himſelf ſafe in any part of *Italy*, ſet out from *Genoa*, the place of his birth, for *Lyons* in the year 1244, and, aſſembling there a council the following year, depoſed, in their preſence, though not with their approbation, the emperor FREDERIC, and declared the imperial throne vacant [n]. This unjuſt and inſolent meaſure was regarded with ſuch veneration, and looked upon as ſo weighty by the German princes, ſeduced and blinded by the ſuperſtition of the times, that they proceeded inſtantly to a new election, and raiſed firſt, HENRY, landgrave of *Thuringia*, and after his death, WILLIAM count of *Holland* to the head of the empire. FREDERIC, whoſe firm and heroic ſpirit ſupported without dejection theſe cruel viciſſitudes, continued to carry on the war in *Italy*, until a violent dyſentery ended his days in *Apulia*, the 13th of December, 1250. Upon the death of his formidable and magnanimous adverſary, INNOCENT returned into *Italy* [o], hoping now to enjoy with ſecurity the fruits of his ambition. It was principally from this period, that the two famous factions, called *Guelphs* and *Ghibelines*, of which the latter eſpouſed the cauſe of the emperors, and the former that of the pontifs, involved all the Italian ſtates in the moſt fatal diſſenſions, though their origin is much earlier than this century [p].

---

[k] Beſides the original and authentic authors collected by MURATORI, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, and the German and Italian hiſtorians, few or none of whom are abſolutely void of partiality in their accounts of theſe unhappy conteſts between the empire and the papacy, ſee PETRUS DE VINEIS, *Epiſtol. Lib.* i. and MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtoria Major*. Add to theſe RAYNALDI *Annal.*—MURATORI *Annal. Italiæ*, tom. vii. & *Antiquit. Italic.* tom. iv. p. 325. 517. It muſt, however, be obſerved, that this branch of hiſtory ſtands yet in need of farther illuſtrations.

[l] See MATTHEW PARIS, *Hiſtoria Major, ad A.* 1254. p. 771.

[(m) Theſe preliminary conditions were: 1*ſt*, That the emperor ſhould give up entirely to the church the inheritance which was left to it by MATHILDA; and 2*dly*, That he would oblige himſelf to ſubmit to whatever terms the pope ſhould think fit to propoſe, as conditions of peace.]

[n] This aſſembly is placed in the liſt of *œcumenical*, or general councils; but it is not acknowledged as ſuch by the Gallican church.

Alexander IV.
Urban IV.

XII. RAYNALD, count of *Segni*, and biſhop of *Oſtia*, was raiſed to the pontificate after the death of INNOCENT, in the year 1254, and is diſtinguiſhed in the liſt of the popes by the name of ALEXANDER IV. During the ſix years and ſix months that he governed the ſee of *Rome*, his time was leſs employed in civil affairs, than in regulating the internal ſtate of the church, if we except the meaſures he took for the deſtruction of CONRADIN, grandſon of FREDERIC II, and for compoſing the tumults that had ſo long reigned without interruption in *Italy*. The mendicant friars, in particular, and among them the Dominicans and Franciſcans, were much favoured by this pontif, and received ſeveral marks of his peculiar bounty.

He was ſucceeded in the Roman ſee A. D. 1261, by URBAN IV, a native of *Troyes*, of obſcure birth, who, before his elevation to the pontificate, was patriarch of *Jeruſalem*, and after that period was more diſtinguiſhed by his inſtituting the *Feſtival of the body of Chriſt*, than by any other circumſtance in the courſe of his reign. He had, indeed, formed ſeveral important projects, but their execution was prevented by his death which happened, in the year 1264, after a ſhort reign of three years. His ſucceſſor GUI FULCODI, or CLEMENS IV, a native of *France*, and biſhop of *Sabino*, who was raiſed to the ſee of *Rome* in the year 1265, did not enjoy much longer that high dignity. His name, however, makes a greater figure in hiſtory, and was rendered famous in many reſpects, and more eſpecially by his conferring the kingdom of *Naples* upon CHARLES of *Anjou*, brother to LEWIS IX king of *France*. The conſequences of this donation are well known, and the fate of CONRADIN, the laſt deſcendant of FREDERIC II, who, after an unfortunate battle fought againſt CHARLES, was publicly beheaded by the barbarous victor, if not by the counſel, yet certainly with the conſent, of the Roman pontif, are well known to ſuch as have the ſmalleſt acquaintance with the hiſtory of theſe unhappy times.

Gregory X.

XIII. Upon the death of CLEMENT IV [q], there aroſe warm and vehement conteſts among the cardinals concerning the election of a new pontif. Theſe debates, which kept the Roman ſee vacant during the ſpace of three years, were, at length, terminated in favour of THEALD, or THIBALD, a native of *Placentia*, and archbiſhop of *Liege*, who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1271, and aſſumed the title of GREGORY X [r]. This devout eccleſiaſtic was in the Holy Land when he received the news of his election; and, as he had been an eye-witneſs of the miſerable condition of the Chriſtians in that country, he had nothing ſo much at heart, as the deſire of contributing to their relief. Hence it was, that, immediately after his conſecration, he ſummoned a council to meet at *Lyons*, in the year 1274, in which the relief and maintenance of the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine*, and the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches were the two great points, that were to come principally under deliberation. This aſſembly is acknowledged as the fourteenth general council, and is rendered particularly remarkable by the new regulations that were introduced into the manner of electing the Roman pontif, and more eſpecially, by the famous law, which is ſtill in force, and by which it was enacted, that the cardinal electors ſhould be ſhut up in the conclave during the vacancy of the pontificate. With reſpect to the character and ſentiments of the new pope we ſhall only obſerve, that, though he ſeemed to be actuated by a milder ſpirit than many of his predeceſſors, yet he inculcated, without the leaſt heſitation, that odious maxim of GREGORY VII, that declared the biſhop of *Rome*, the lord of the world, and, in a more eſpecial manner, of the Roman empire. It was in conſequence of this preſumptuous ſyſtem, that, in the year 1271, he wrote an imperious and threatning letter to the German princes, in which, deaf to the pretenſions and remonſtrances of ALPHONSUS, king of *Caſtile* [s], he orders them to elect an emperor without delay, aſſuring them, that, if they did not do it immediately, he would do it for them. This letter produced the deſigned effect; an electoral diet was aſſembled at *Francfort*, and RODOLPHUS, count of *Hapſbourg*, was raiſed to the imperial throne.

---

[o] Beſides the writers already mentioned, ſee NICOL. DE CURBIO, *Vita Innocentii* IV, in BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. vii. p. 353.

[p] See MURATORII *Diſſertat. de Guelphis et Ghibellinis*, in his *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iv. p. 606.

[q] Which happened in the year 1268.

Innocent V.
Adrian V.
John XXI.
Nicolas III.

XIV. GREGORY X was ſucceeded, in the year 1276, by PETER of *Tarantaiſe*, of the dominican order, and biſhop of *Oſtia*, who aſſumed the name of INNOCENT V, and died about five months after his election. OTTOBONI, a native of *Genoa*, and cardinal of *St. Adrian*, was choſen in his place, took the title of ADRIAN V [t], and, after having ruled the church during five weeks, was ſucceeded by PETER JULIAN, biſhop of *Tuſculum*, who enjoyed that high dignity about eight months, and is diſtinguiſhed in the papal liſt by the name of JOHN XXI [u]. The ſee of *Rome* continued vacant for above ſix months after the death of the laſt mentioned pontif, but was, at length, filled in the month of November, 1277, by JOHN CAJETAN, of the family of *Urſins*, cardinal of *St. Nicolas*, whoſe name he adopted for his papal title. This famous pontif, as has been already obſerved, augmented greatly both the opulence and authority of the biſhops of *Rome*, and had formed vaſt projects, which his undaunted courage and his remarkable activity would have enabled him, without doubt, to execute with ſucceſs, had not death blaſted his hopes, and diſconcerted his ambitious ſchemes.

---

[r] The records of this election are publiſhed by LUC. WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 330.

[(s) ALPHONSUS, king of *Caſtile*, had been elected emperor in the year 1256, by the archbiſhop of *Triers*, the duke of *Saxony*, the margrave of *Brandenburg*, and the king of *Bohemia*, in oppoſition to RICHARD, duke of *Cornwall*, brother of HENRY III king of *England*, who was at the ſame time raiſed to the ſame dignity by the archbiſhops of *Mentz* and *Cologn*, the count *Palatine* of the *Rhine*, and the duke of *Bavaria*.]

[(t) We read in the Latin, ADRIAN VI, which is more probably an error of the preſs, than a fault of the author.]

[(u) In the original Dr. MOSHEIM obſerves, that theſe three ſucceſſors of GREGORY were elected and carried off by death in the year 1276; but here he has fallen into a ſlight miſtake; for JOHN XXI died the 16th of May, 1277.]

Martin IV.
Nicolas IV.

XV. He was ſucceeded in the year 1281, about ſix months after his departure from this life, by SIMON DE BRIE, who adopted the name of MARTIN IV, and was not inferior to NICOLAS III, in ambition, arrogance, and conſtancy of mind, of which he gave ſeveral proofs during his pontificate. MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, the Grecian emperor, was one of the firſt princes, who was ſolemnly excommunicated by this audacious prieſt, and that, under the pretext of his having broken the peace that had been concluded between the Greek and Latin churches, at the council of *Lyons* [*w*]. The ſame inſult was committed againſt PETER, king of *Arragon*, whom MARTIN not only excluded from the boſom of the church, but alſo depoſed from his throne, on account of his attempt upon *Sicily*, and made a grant of his kingdom, fiefs, and poſſeſſions to CHARLES, ſon of PHILIP the Bold [*x*], king of *France*. It was during the execution of ſuch daring enterprizes as theſe, and while he was meditating ſtill greater things for the glory of the Roman hierarchy, that a ſudden death, in the year 1285, obliged him to leave his ſchemes unfiniſhed. They were, however, proſecuted with great ſpirit by his ſucceſſor JAMES SAVELLI, who choſe the denomination of HONORIUS IV, but was alſo ſtopt ſhort, in the midſt of his career, in the year 1287, having ruled the church only two years. JEROME D'ASCOLI, biſhop of *Præneſte* [*y*], who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1288, and is known by the name of NICOLAS IV, diſtinguiſhed himſelf, during the four years that he remained at the head of the church, by his aſſiduous application both to eccleſiaſtical and political affairs. Sometimes we ſee the diſputes of ſovereign powers left to his arbitration, and terminated by his deciſion; at other times, we find him maintaining the pretenſions and privileges of the church with the moſt reſolute zeal, and the moſt obſtinate perſeverance; at other times, again, we ſee him employing, with the utmoſt aſſiduity, every probable method of propagating the goſpel among the Tartars and other eaſtern nations. But the object which, of all others, occupied moſt the thoughts of this vigilant and zealous pontif, was the deſperate ſtate of the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine*, who were now reduced to the greateſt extremities of miſery and weakneſs. His laborious efforts were, therefore, employed for the reſtoration of their former grandeur; they were, however, employed in vain, and his death, which happened in the year 1292, diſconcerted all the projects he had formed for that purpoſe.

[*w*] This council had been held under the pontificate of GREGORY X.

[*x*] PHILIPPE LE HARDI, as he is called by the French.

[(*y*) JEROM was biſhop of *Palæſtrina*, and not of *Præneſte*. See FLEURY and the greateſt part of the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians.]

Celeſtine V.

XVI. The death of this pontif was followed by a vacancy of three years in the ſee of *Rome*, which was owing to the diſputes that aroſe among the cardinals about the election of a new pope. Theſe diſputes were, at length, terminated, and the contending parties united their ſuffrages in favour of PETER, ſurnamed DI MURRONE, from a mountain where he had hitherto lived in the deepeſt ſolitude and with the utmoſt auſterity. This venerable old man, who was in high renown on account of the remarkable ſanctity of his life and converſation, was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1294, and aſſumed the name of CELESTINE V. But the auſterity of his manners, which was a tacit reproach upon the corruption of the Roman court, and more eſpecially upon the luxury of the cardinals, rendered him extremely diſagreeable to a degenerate and licentious clergy; and this diſlike was ſo heightened by the whoſe courſe of his adminiſtration, which ſhewed that he had more at heart the reformation and purity of the church, than the increaſe of its opulence and the propagation of its authority, that he was almoſt univerſally conſidered as unworthy of the pontificate. Hence it was, that ſeveral of the cardinals, and particularly BENEDICT CAJETAN, adviſed him to abdicate the papacy which he had accepted with ſuch reluctance, and they had the pleaſure of finding their advice received with the utmoſt docility. The good man reſigned his dignity the fourth month after his election, and died in the year 1296, in the caſtle of *Fumone*, where his tyrannic and ſuſpicious ſucceſſor kept him in captivity, that he might not be engaged, by the ſollicitations of his friends, to attempt the recovery of his abdicated honours. His memory was precious to the virtuous part of the church, and he was elevated to the rank of a ſaint by CLEMENT V. It was from him that the branch of the Benedictine order, called *Celeſtins*, and which yet ſubſiſts in *France* and in *Italy*, derived its origin [z].

Boniface VIII.

XVII. BENEDICT CAJETAN, who had perſuaded the good pontif now mentioned to reſign his place, ſucceeded him in it in the year 1294, and took the name of BONIFACE VIII. We may ſay, with truth, of this unworthy prelate, that he was born to be a plague both to church and ſtate, a diſturber of the repoſe of nations, and that his attempts to extend and confirm the deſpotiſm of the Roman pontifs, were carried to a length that approached to frenzy. From the moment that he entered upon his new dignity, he laid claim to a ſupreme and irreſiſtible dominion over all the powers of the earth, both ſpiritual and temporal, terrified kingdoms and empires with the thunder of his bulls, called princes and ſovereign ſtates before his tribunal to decide their quarrels, augmented the papal juriſprudence with a new body of laws, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of the Decretals*, declared war againſt the illuſtrious family of *Colonna*, who diſputed his title to the pontificate [a]; in a word, exhibited to the church and to *Europe*, a lively image of the tyrannical adminiſtration of GREGORY VII,

---

[z] HELYOT, *Hiſtoire des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 180.

[a] [The reaſons they alledged for diſputing the title of BONIFACE to the pontificate were, that the reſignation of CELESTIN was not *canonical*, and, moreover, that it was brought about by fraudulent means.]

whom

whom he perhaps ſurpaſſed in arrogance [b]. It was this pontif that, in the year 1300, inſtituted the famous jubilee, which, ſince that time, has been regularly celebrated in the Roman church at certain fixed periods. But the conſideration of this inſtitution, which was ſo favorable to the progreſs of licentiouſneſs and corruption, as alſo the other exploits of BONIFACE, and his deplorable end, belong to the hiſtory of the following century [c].

New monaſtic orders.

XVIII. In the council of Lateran that was held in the year 1215, a decree was paſſed, by the advice of INNOCENT III, to prevent the introduction of *new religions*, by which was meant, new monaſtic inſtitutions. This decree, however, ſeemed to be very little reſpected, either by that pontif, or his ſucceſſors, ſince ſeveral religious orders, hitherto unknown in the Chriſtian world, were not only tolerated, but were, moreover, diſtinguiſhed by peculiar marks of approbation and favor, and enriched with various privileges and prerogatives. Nor will this tacit abrogation of the decree of INNOCENT appear at all ſurprizing to ſuch as conſider the ſtate of the church in this century. For not to mention many enormities that contributed to the ſuſpenſion of this decree, we ſhall only obſerve, that the enemies of Chriſtianity, and the *heretical* ſects, increaſed daily every where; and, on the other hand, the *ſecular* clergy were more attentive to their worldly advantages than to the intereſts of the church, and ſpent in mirth and jollity the opulence with which the piety of their anceſtors had enriched that ſacred body. The monaſtic orders alſo had almoſt all degenerated from their primitive ſanctity, and, exhibiting the moſt offenſive and ſhocking examples of licentiouſneſs and vice to public view, rendered by their flagitious lives the cauſe of hereſy triumphant, inſtead of retarding its progreſs. All theſe things being conſidered, it was thought neceſſary to encourage the eſtabliſhment of new monaſtic ſocieties, who, by the ſanctity of their manners, might attract the eſteem and veneration of the people, and diminiſh the indignation which the tyranny and ambition of the pontifs had ſo univerſally excited; and who, by their diligence and addreſs, their diſcourſes and their arguments, their power and arms, when theſe violent means were required, might diſcover, perſecute, convert, and vanquiſh the growing tribe of heretics.

Several of the monaſtic inſtitutions ſuppreſſed.

XIX. Of the religious ſocieties that aroſe in this century ſome are now entirely ſuppreſſed, while others continue to flouriſh, and are in high repute at this preſent time. Among the former we may reckon the *Humiliati* (a title expreſſive of great humility and ſelf-abaſement) whoſe origin may be traced to a much earlier period than the preſent century, though their order was confirmed and new modelled by INNOCENT III, who ſubjected it to the rule of St. BENEDICT. Theſe *humble* monks became ſo ſhockingly licentious in proceſs of time, that, in the year 1571, Pope PIUS V was obliged to diſſolve their ſociety [d]. We may alſo place in the liſt of the ſuppreſſed monaſteries the *Jacobins*, who were erected into a religious order by INNOCENT III [e], and who, in this very century, not long after the council of *Lyons*, were deprived of their charter; the *Valliſcholares*, or *ſcholars of the valley*, ſo called from their being inſtituted by the *ſcholares*, i. e. the four profeſſors of divinity in the univerſity of *Paris*, and from a deep vale in the province of *Champagne* in which they aſſembled and fixed their reſidence in the year 1234 [f]. This ſociety, whoſe foundation was laid about the commencement of this century, was formerly governed by the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, but is now incorporated into the order of the *Regular canons of St. Genivieve*. To the ſame claſs belong the *order of the bleſſed Virgin Mary the mother of Chriſt*, which had its commencement in the year 1266, and was ſuppreſſed in 1274 [g]; the *Knights of faith and charity*, who undertook to diſperſe the bands of robbers that infeſted the public roads in *France*, and who were favored with the peculiar protection and approbation of GREGORY IX [h]; the *Hermits of St. William duke of Aquitaine* [i]; not to mention the *Brethren of the ſack*, the *Bethlehemites*, and other orders of inferior note, that ſtarted up in this century, which, of all others, was the moſt remarkable for the number and variety of monaſtic eſtabliſhments, that date their origin from it [k].

---

[b] There is a hiſtory of this pontif written by JO. RUBEUS, a Benedictin monk, whoſe work, which is entitled BONIFACIUS VIII, *e familia Cajetanorum principum Romanus pontifex*, was publiſhed at *Rome* in the year 1651, in 4^to^.

[c] In this account of the popes I have chiefly followed DANIEL PAPEBROCH, FRANCIS PAGI, and MURATORI, in his *Annales Italiæ*, conſulting, at the ſame time, the original ſources collected by the laſt mentioned author, in his *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*.

The convents that ſtill ſubſiſt.

XX. Among the convents that were founded in this century, and ſtill ſubſiſt, the principal place is due to that of the *ſervites*, i. e. *the ſervants of the bleſſed Virgin*, whoſe order was firſt inſtituted, A. D. 1233, in *Tuſcany*, by ſeven Florentine merchants, and afterwards made a great progreſs under the government of PHILIP BENIZI its chief. This order, though ſubjected to the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, was, nevertheleſs, erected in commemoration of the moſt holy widowhood of the bleſſed Virgin; for which reaſon its monks wear a black habit [l], and obſerve ſeveral rules unknown to other monaſteries. The prodigious numbers of Chriſtians, that were made priſoners by the Mahometans in *Paleſtine*, gave riſe, towards the concluſion of the xiith century, to the inſtitution of the order, entitled, *The Fraternity of the Trinity*, which, in the following age, received a ſtill greater degree of ſtability under the pontificate of HONORIUS III, and alſo of his ſucceſſor CLEMENT IV. The firſt founders of this inſtitution were JOHN DE

---

[d] HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. vi. p. 152.

[e] MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſt. Major*, p. 161.

[f] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 15.—*Acta Sanct. Menſ. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 482.

[g] DION. SAMMARTHANI *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 653.

[h] *Gallia Chriſt.* tom. i. *Append.* p. 165.—MARTENE, *Voyage Litter. de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 23.

[i] JO. BOLLANDI *De ordine Eremitar. S. Guilielmi Comm. in actis SS. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 472.

[k] MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſt. Major*, p. 815. edit. *Watts*. Where, ſpeaking of the prodigious number of convents that were founded in *England* during this century, he expreſſeth himſelf thus: *Tot jam apparuerunt ordines in Anglia, ut ordinum confuſio videretur inordinata.*

[l] Beſides the ordinary writers of the Monaſtic Hiſtory, ſee PAULI FLORENTINI *Dialog. de origine Ordinis Servorum*, in LAMII *Deliciis Eruditorum*, tom. i. p. 1—48.

MATHA and FELIX DE VALOIS, two pious men, who led an auſtere and ſolitary life at *Cerfroy*, in the dioceſe of *Meaux*, which is ſtill the ſeat of the principal convent of the order. The monks of this ſociety are called the *Brethren of the Holy Trinity*, becauſe all their churches are ſolemnly dedicated to that profound myſtery; they are alſo ſtyled MATHURINS, from their having a monaſtery at *Paris* erected in a place where there is a chapel conſecrated to St. MATHURIN, and *Brethren of the redemption of captives* [m], becauſe the grand deſign of their inſtitution was to find out means for reſtoring liberty to the Chriſtian captives in the Holy Land, in which charitable work they are obliged to employ the third part of their revenue. Their manner of life was, at firſt, extremely abſtemious and auſtere; but its auſterity has been from time to time conſiderably mitigated by the indulgence and lenity of the pontifs [n].

The mendicant order.

XXI. The religious ſociety that ſurpaſſed all the reſt in the purity of its manners, the extent of its fame, the number of its privileges, and the multitude of its members, was that of the *Mendicant*, or begging friars, whoſe order was firſt eſtabliſhed in this century, and who, by the tenor of their inſtitution, were to remain entirely deſtitute of all fixed revenues and poſſeſſions. The preſent ſtate and circumſtances of the church rendered the eſtabliſhment of ſuch an order abſolutely neceſſary. The monaſtic orders, who wallowed in opulence, were, by the corrupting influence of their ample poſſeſſions, lulled in a luxurious indolence. They loſt ſight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their ſuperiors, ſuffered hereſy to triumph unreſtrained, and the ſectaries to form aſſemblies in ſeveral places; in ſhort, they were incapable of contributing in any reſpect to promote the true intereſts of the church, and abandoned themſelves, without either ſhame or remorſe, to all manner of crimes. On the other hand, the enemies of the church, the various ſects which had left its communion, followed certain auſtere rules of life and conduct, which formed a ſtrong contraſt between them and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiouſneſs of the latter ſtill more offenſive and ſhocking to the people. Theſe ſects maintained, that voluntary poverty was the leading and eſſential quality in a ſervant of CHRIST, obliged their doctors to imitate the ſimplicity

---

[(m) BROUGHTON and ſome other writers make a diſtinction between the *Order of the redemption of captives*, and the *Fraternity*, or *Brethren of the Holy Trinity*. They alledge, that the latter order was inſtituted at *Rome* by St. PHILIP NERI in the year 1548, about 350 years after the firſt eſtabliſhment of the former, and that the monks, who compoſed it, were obliged, by their vow, to take care of the pilgrims who reſorted from all parts of the world to *Rome*, to viſit the tombs of St. PETER and St. PAUL.]

[n] Beſide HELYOT and the other writers of the Monaſtic Hiſtory, ſee TOUSSAINT DE PLESSIS, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe de Meaux*, tom. i. p. 172 & 566.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 523.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 133. In the ancient records this ſociety is frequently ſtyled the *Order of Aſſes*, on account of the prohibition of the uſe of horſes, which made a part of their *rule*, and which obliged the mendicant monks to ride upon aſſes. See CAR. DU FRESNE's *Notes upon Joinville's Life of St. Lewis*, p. 81. But at preſent, through the indulgence of the Roman pontifs, they are permitted to make uſe of horſes when they find them neceſſary. An order of the ſame kind was inſtituted in *Spain*, in the year 1228, by PAUL NOLASCO, under the title of the *Order of St. Mary for the redemption of captives*. See the *Acta Sanctorum Januar.* tom. ii. p. 980.

of the apoſtles, reproached the church with its overgrown opulence, and the vices and corruptions of the clergy, that flowed from thence as from their natural ſource, and by this commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree of reſpect, and gained a prodigious aſcendant over the minds of the multitude. All this rendered it abſolutely neceſſary to introduce into the church a ſett of men, who, by the auſterity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and ſanctity of their conduct and maxims, might reſemble the doctors, who had gained ſuch reputation to the heretical ſects, and who might be ſo far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleaſure, as not to be ſeduced by the promiſes or threats of kings and princes, from the performance of the duties they owed to the church, or from perſevering in their ſubordination to the Roman pontifs. INNOCENT III was the firſt of the popes who perceived the neceſſity of inſtituting ſuch an order; and, accordingly, he gave ſuch monaſtic ſocieties as made a profeſſion of poverty the moſt diſtinguiſhing marks of his protection and favour. They were alſo encouraged and patronized by the ſucceeding pontifs, when experience had demonſtrated their public and extenſive uſefulneſs. But when it became generally known, that they had ſuch a peculiar place in the eſteem and protection of the rulers of the church, their number grew to ſuch an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and ſwarmed ſo prodigiouſly in all the European provinces, that they became a burthen, not only to the people, but to the church itſelf.

Its hiſtory.

XXII. The great inconveniency that aroſe from the exceſſive multiplication of the mendicant orders was remedied by GREGORY X, in a general council which he aſſembled at *Lyons* in the year 1272. For here all the religious orders, that had ſprung up after the council held, at *Rome*, in the year 1215, under the pontificate of INNOCENT III, were ſuppreſſed, and the *extravagant multitude of mendicants*, as GREGORY called them, were reduced to a ſmaller number, and confined to the four following ſocieties, or denominations, *viz.* the *Dominicans*, the *Franciſcans*, the *Carmelites*, and the *Hermits of St. Auguſtin* [o]. The *Carmelite* order which had been inſtituted in *Paleſtine*, during the preceding century, was, in this, tranſplanted into *Europe*, and, in the year 1226, was favored by pope HONORIUS III, with a place among the monaſtic ſocieties, which enjoyed the protection and approbation of the church. The *Hermits of St. Auguſtin* had for their founder ALEXANDER IV, who, obſerving that the *Hermits* were divided into ſeveral ſocieties, ſome of which followed the maxins of the famous WILLIAM, others the rule of St. AUGUSTIN, while others again were diſtinguiſhed by different denominations, formed the wiſe project of uniting them all into one religious order, and ſubjecting them to the ſame rule of diſcipline, even that which bears the name of St. Augustin. This project was put in execution in the year 1256.

---

[o] *Concil. Lugd.* II. *A.* 1274, Can. xxiii. in JO. HARDUINI *Conciliis*, tom. vii. p. 715. *Importuna potentium inhiatio Religionum* (ſo were the religious orders entitled) *multiplicationem extorſit, verum etiam aliquorum præſumptuoſa temeritas diverſorum ordinum, præcipue Mendicantium* . . . . effrænatam multitudinem adinvenit . . . . *Hinc ordines Mendicantes poſt dictum concilium* (*i. e.* the council of Lateran held in 1215) *adinventos* . . . *perpetuæ prohibitioni ſubjicimus.*

[p] This edict of pope ALEXANDER IV is to be found in the new edition of the *Bullarium Romanum*, tom. i. p. 110.—See alſo *Acta Sanctor. Menſ. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 472.

Attracts the veneration and eſteem of the public.

XXIII. As the pontifs allowed theſe four Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of converſing with perſons of all ranks, of inſtructing the youth, and the multitude wherever they went; and, as theſe monks exhibited in their outward appearance and manner of life, more ſtriking marks of gravity and holineſs, than were obſervable in the other monaſtic ſocieties, they aroſe all at once to the very ſummit of fame, and were regarded with the utmoſt eſteem and veneration throughout all the countries of *Europe*. The enthuſiaſtic attachment to theſe ſanctimonious beggars went ſo far, that, as we learn from the moſt authentic records, ſeveral cities were divided, or cantoned out, into four parts, with a view to theſe four orders; the firſt part was aſſigned to the Dominicans; the ſecond, to the Franciſcans; the third, to the Carmelites; and the fourth, to the Auguſtinians. The people were unwilling to receive the ſacraments from any other hands than thoſe of the Mendicants, to whoſe churches they crowded to perform their devotions, while living, and were extremely deſirous to depoſite there alſo their remains, after death; all which occaſioned grievous complaints among the ordinary prieſts, to whom the cure of ſouls was committed, and who conſidered themſelves as the ſpiritual guides of the multitude. Nor did the influence and credit of the Mendicants end here; for we find in the hiſtory of this and of the ſucceeding ages, that they were employed not only in ſpiritual matters, but alſo in temporal and political affairs of the greateſt conſequence, in compoſing the differences of princes, concluding treaties of peace, concerting alliances, preſiding in cabinet-councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and other occupations, not only remote from, but abſolutely inconſiſtent with, the monaſtic character and profeſſion.

The Dominicans.

XXIV. We muſt not however imagine, that all the Mendicant friars attained to the ſame degree of reputation and authority; for the power of the Dominicans and Franciſcans ſurpaſſed vaſtly that of the other two orders, and rendered them ſingularly conſpicuous in the eyes of the world. During three centuries theſe two fraternities governed, with an almoſt univerſal and abſolute ſway, both ſtate and church, filled the moſt eminent poſts eccleſiaſtical and civil, taught in the univerſities and churches with an authority, before which all oppoſition was ſilent, and maintained the pretended majeſty and prerogatives of the Roman pontifs againſt kings, princes, biſhops, and heretics with incredible ardor and equal ſucceſs. The Dominicans and Franciſcans were, before the reformation, what the Jeſuits have been ſince that happy and glorious period, the very ſoul of the hierarchy, the engines of the ſtate, the ſecret ſprings of all the motions of the one and the other, and the authors or directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world. Dominic, a Spaniard by birth, a native of the village of *Calaroga*, deſcendant of the illuſtrious houſe of *Guzman*, and regular canon of *Oſma*, a man of a fiery and impetuous temper, and vehemently exaſperated by the commotions and conteſts which the heretics of different denominations had excited in the church, ſet out for *France* with a few companions in order to combat the ſectaries, that were multiplied in that kingdom. This enterprize he executed with the greateſt vigour, and, we may add, fury, attacking the Albigenſes and the other enemies of the church with the power of eloquence, the force of arms, the ſubtilty of controverſial writings, and the terrors of the *inquiſition*, which owed its form to this violent and ſanguine prieſt. Paſſing from thence into *Italy*, he was honoured by the Roman pontifs INNOCENT III and HONORIUS III with the moſt diſtinguiſhed marks of their protection and favour; and, after many labours in the cauſe of the church, obtained from them the privilege of erecting this new fraternity, whoſe principal deſign was the extirpation of error, and the deſtruction of heretics. The firſt rule which he adopted for the new ſociety was that of the *Canons of St. Auguſtin*, to which he added ſeveral auſtere precepts and obſervances. But he afterwards changed the diſcipline of the canons for that of the monks; and, holding a chapter of the order at *Bologna* in the year 1220, he obliged the brethren to take a vow of abſolute poverty, and to abandon entirely all their revenues and all their poſſeſſions. He did not live long enough to ſee the conſequences of this reformation, for he died the year following at *Bologna* [q]. His monks were, at firſt, diſtinguiſhed by the denomination of *preaching friars*, becauſe public inſtruction was the main end of their inſtitution; but were afterwards called Dominicans after their founder [r]. [Juſt before his death DOMINIC ſent GILBERT DE FRESNEY with twelve of the brethren into *England*, where they founded their firſt monaſtery at *Oxford* in the year 1221, and ſoon after, another at *London*. In the year 1276, the mayor and aldermen of the city of *London* gave them two whole ſtreets by the river *Thames*, where they erected a very commodious convent, whence that place is ſtill called *Black-Fryars*, for ſo the Dominicans were called in *England*.]

The Franciſcans.

XXV. FRANCIS, the founder of the famous order that bears his name, was the ſon of a merchant of *Aſſiſi*, in the province of *Umbria*, and a young man who led, for ſome time, a moſt debauched and diſſolute life. Upon his recovery from a ſevere fit of ſickneſs, which was the conſequence and puniſhment of his licentious conduct, he changed his method of living, and, as extremes are natural to men of warm imaginations, fell into an extravagant kind of devotion that looked leſs like religion, than alienation of mind. Sometime after this [s], he happened to be in a church, where he heard that paſſage of the ſcriptures repeated, in which CHRIST addreſſes his apoſtles in the following manner: *Provide neither gold, nor ſilver, nor braſs in your purſes, nor ſcrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither ſhoes, nor yet ſtaves, for the workman is worthy of his meat* [t]. This produced a powerful effect upon his mind, made him conſider a voluntary and abſolute poverty as the eſſence of the goſpel, and the ſoul of religion, and preſcribe this poverty as a ſacred rule, both to himſelf, and to the few that followed him. Such was the commencement of the famous Franciſcan order, whoſe founder and chief was, undoubtedly, a pious and well-meaning man, though groſsly ignorant, and manifeſtly weakened in his intellect by the diſorder from which he had but lately recovered. Be that as it may, the new ſociety, which appeared to INNOCENT III extremely adapted to the preſent ſtate of the church, and proper to reſtore its declining credit, was ſolemnly approved and confirmed by HONORIUS III in the year 1223, and had already made a conſiderable progreſs when its devout founder was called from this life in the year 1226. FRANCIS, through an exceſſive humility, would not ſuffer the monks of his order to be called *Fratres*, i. e. *brethren*, or *friars*, but *Fraterculi*, i. e. *little brethren*, or *friars-minors* [u], by which denomination they ſtill continue to be diſtinguiſhed [w]. The Franciſcans came into *England* in the reign of HENRY III, and their firſt eſtabliſhment was at *Canterbury*.

---

[q] See JAC. ECHARD. and QUETIF *in Scriptoribus Ord. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 84.—*Acta Sanctor. April.* tom. iii. p. 872.—NICOL. JANSENII *Vita S. Dominici*, *Antwerp* 1622, in 8^{vo}. Add to theſe the long liſt of writers mentioned by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. med. ævi*, tom. ii. p. 137. and alſo ANTONII BREMONDI *Bullarium Ordinis Dominicani*, publiſhed ſome years ago at *Rome*.

[r] The Dominicans are called *Fratres Majores* in ſeveral of the ancient records, ſee ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. ii. p. 172. This appellation, however, by which the Dominicans were ſet in oppoſition to the Franciſcans, who call themſelves *Fratres Minores*, is rather a term of deriſion, than a real name. In *France* the Dominicans are called *Jacobins*, from the ſtreet where their firſt convent was erected at *Paris* in the year 1218, which ſtreet was dedicated to *St. James*, and is ſtill known by the name of *Rue de St. Jaques*.

[s] In the year 1208.

The eminent ſervices rendered to the Roman pontifs by the Dominicans and Franciſcans.

XXVI. Theſe two celebrated orders reſtored the church from that declining condition in which it had been languiſhing for many years, by the zeal and activity with which they ſet themſelves to diſcover and extirpate heretics, to undertake various negotiations and embaſſies for the intereſts of the hierarchy, and to confirm the wavering multitude in their implicit obedience to the Roman pontifs. Theſe ghoſtly rulers, on the other hand, ſenſible of theſe obligations to the new monks, which, no doubt, were very great, not only employed them in every affair they looked upon as of high importance, and raiſed them to the moſt eminent ſtations in the church, but alſo accumulated upon them employments and privileges, which, if they enriched them on the one hand, could not fail to render them odious on the other [x], and to excite the envy and complaints of other eccleſiaſtics. Such, among many other extraordinary prerogatives, was the permiſſion they received from the pontifs, of preaching to the multitude, hearing *confeſſion*, and pronouncing *abſolution*, without any licence from the biſhops, and even without conſulting them; to which we may add the heap of ample and extenſive *indulgences*, whoſe diſtribution was committed by the popes to the Franciſcans, as a mean of ſubſiſtence and a rich indemnification for their voluntary poverty [y]. Theſe acts of liberality and marks of protection, laviſhed upon the Dominican and Franciſcan *friars* with ſuch an ill-judged profuſion, as they overturned the ancient diſcipline of the church, and were a manifeſt encroachment upon the rights of the firſt and ſecond orders of the eccleſiaſtical rulers, produced the moſt unhappy and bitter diſſenſions between the Mendicant orders and the biſhops. And theſe diſſenſions, extending their contagious influence beyond the limits of the church, excited throughout all the European provinces, and even in the city of *Rome* [z], under the very eye of the pontifs, the moſt dreadful diſturbances and tumults. The meaſures taken by the popes to appeaſe theſe tumults were various, but ineffectual; becauſe their principal view was to ſupport the cauſe of their faithful ſervants and creatures, the Mendicant friars, and to maintain them in the poſſeſſion of their honours and advantages [a].

---

[t] *Matthew* x. 9, 10.

[u] They were called *Fratricelli* by the Italians, *Freres Mineurs* by the French, and *Fratres Minores* by the Latin writers.

[w] BONAVENTURE wrote a life of St. FRANCIS, which has paſſed through ſeveral editions. But the moſt ample and circumſtantial accounts of this extraordinary man are given by LUKE WADDING, in the firſt volume of his *Annal. Minorum*, which contains a complete hiſtory of the Franciſcan order, confirmed by a great number of authentic records, and the beſt edition of which is that publiſhed at *Rome* in 1731 and the following years, in eighteen volumes in folio, by JOSEPH MARIA FONSECA ab EBORA. It is to the ſame WADDING that we are obliged for the *Opuſcula Sti. Franciſci*, and the *Bibliotheca Ordinis Minorum*, the former of which was publiſhed in 4to at *Antwerp* in the year 1623, and the latter at *Rome*, in 4to likewiſe, in 1650. The other writers, who have given accounts of the Franciſcan order, are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 573.

[x] The popes were ſo infatuated with the Franciſcans, that thoſe whom they could not employ more honourably in their civil negociations or domeſtic affairs they made their publicans, beadles, &c. See for a confirmation of this the following paſſages in the *Hiſtor. Major* of MATTHEW PARIS: *Fratres minores et prædicatores* (ſays he) *invitos, ut credimus, jam ſuos fecit dominus papa, non ſine*

The diſpute between the Dominicans and the univerſity of *Paris*.

XXVII. Among all the controverſies which were maintained by the Mendicants, whether againſt the biſhops, abbots, ſchools, or other religious orders, none was ſo famous, as that which aroſe, in the year 1228, between the Dominicans and the univerſity of *Paris*, and which was prolonged, with various ſucceſs, until the year 1259. The Dominicans claimed, as their unqueſtionable right, two theological claſſes in that celebrated univerſity, one of which had been taken from them, and an academical law paſſed, that no religious order ſhould have what the Dominicans demanded. Theſe latter, however, perſiſted obſtinately in reclaiming the profeſſorſhip they had loſt; while the doctors of the univerſity perceiving the reſtleſs and contentious ſpirit that animated their efforts excluded them from their ſociety, and formed themſelves into a ſeparate body. This meaſure was conſidered as a

---

ordinis eorum læſione et ſcandalo, teloniarios et bedellos, p. 634.—*Non ceſſavit papa pecuniam aggregare, faciens de Fratribus prædicatoribus et minoribus, etiam invitis, non jam piſcatoribus hominum, ſed nummorum,* p. 639. Conf. p. 662. 664.—*Erant Minores et Prædicatores magnatum conſiliatores et nuncii, etiam domini papæ ſecretarii: nimis in hoc gratiam ſibi ſæcularem comparantes, ad An.* 1236, p. 354.—*Facti ſunt eo tempore Prædicatores et Minores regum conſiliarii et nuntii ſpeciales, ut ſicut quondam mollibus induti in domibus regum erant, ita tunc qui vilibus veſtiebantur, in domibus, cameris, et palatiis eſſent principum. ad An.* 1239, p. 465.

[y] See Baluzii *Miſcellan.* tom. iv. p. 490. tom. vii. p. 392.—It is well known that no religious order had the diſtribution of ſo many, and ſuch ample *indulgences* as the Franciſcans. Nor could theſe good friars live and multiply as they did, without ſome ſuch ſource of profit, ſince, by their inſtitution, they were to be deſtitute of revenues and poſſeſſions of every kind. It was therefore in the place of fixed revenues, that ſuch fat *indulgences* were put into their hands.

[z] Baluzii *Miſcellan.* tom. vii. p. 441.

[a] See Jo. Launoii *Explicata Eccleſiæ Traditio circa Canonem: Omnis utriuſque Sexus,* tom. i. part. I. Opp. p. 247.—Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques, par M.* Du Pin, tom. i. p. 326.—Lenfant, *Hiſtoire du Concile de Piſe,* tom. i. p. 310.—tom. ii. p. 8.—Echardi *Scriptores Dominicani,* tom. i. p. 404. The circumſtances of theſe flaming conteſts are mentioned by all the writers both of this and the following centuries.

declaration of war; and, accordingly, the moſt vehement commotions aroſe between the contending parties. The debate was brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontif in the year 1255; and the deciſion, as might well have been expected, was in favour of the monks. Alexander IV ordered the univerſity of *Paris*, not only to reſtore the Dominicans to their former place in that learned ſociety, but moreover to make a grant to them of as many claſſes or profeſſorſhips, as they ſhould think proper to demand. This unjuſt and deſpotic ſentence was oppoſed by the univerſity with the utmoſt vigour, and thus the conteſt was renewed with double fury. But the magiſtrates of *Paris* were, at length, ſo terrified and overwhelmed with the thundering edicts, and formidable mandates of the exaſperated pontif, that, in the year 1259, they yielded to ſuperior force, and ſatisfied the demands not only of the Dominican, but alſo of the Franciſcan order in obedience to the pope, and to the extent of his commands [*b*]. Hence aroſe that ſecret enmity, that ſilent ill-will, which prevailed ſo long between the univerſity of *Paris* and the Mendicant orders, eſpecially the Dominicans, and which are not yet entirely extinguiſhed.

The Dominicans meet with a formidable adverſary.

XXVIII. In this famous debate none pleaded the cauſe of the univerſity with greater ſpirit, and aſſerted its rights with greater zeal and activity than Guillaume de St. Amour, doctor of the Sorbonne, a man of true genius, worthy to have lived in better times, and capable of adorning a more enlightened age. This vigorous and able champion attacked the whole Mendicant tribe in various treatiſes with the greateſt vehemence, and more eſpecially in a book *Concerning the perils of the latter times*. He maintained publicly, that their diſcipline was in direct oppoſition to the precepts of the goſpel; and that, in confirming and approving it, the popes had been guilty of temerity, and the *church was become chargeable with error* [*c*]. What gave occaſion to the remarkable title of this famous book was the author's being entirely perſuaded that the prophecy of St. Paul related to the *perilous times that were to come in the laſt days* [*c*], was fulfilled in the eſtabliſhment of the Mendicant friars. This notion St. Amour maintained in the warmeſt manner, and proved it, principally, from the book called the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, which was explained publicly by the Dominicans and Franciſcans, and of which we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more fully hereafter. The fury and reſentment of the Mendicants were therefore kindled, in a peculiar manner, againſt this formidable adverſary, whom they perſecuted without interruption, until, in the year 1256, Alexander VI ordered his book to be publicly burnt, and baniſhed its author out of *France*, leſt he ſhould excite the Sorbonne to renew their oppoſition to theſe ghoſtly beggars. St. Amour ſubmitted to the papal edict, and retired into the *Franche Comtè*, which was the place of his birth; but, under the pontificate of CLEMENT IV, he returned to *Paris*, where he illuſtrated the tenets of his famous book in a more extenſive work, and died univerſally eſteemed and regretted by all ranks and orders of men, except the Mendicants [*d*].

[*b*] See Cæs. Egass. du Boulay, *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 138. 240. 244. 248. 266, &c.—Jo. Cordesii, or (to mention him by the name he aſſumes) Jo. Alitophili *Præſ. Hiſtor. et Apologetica ad Opera Guilielmi de S. Amore.*—Antoine Touron, *Vie de S. Thomas*, p. 134.—Waddingi *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 247. 366. tom. iv. p. 14. 52. 106. 263.—Matth. Paris, *Hiſtor. Major, ad An.* 1228, & Nangis *Chronicon* apud Dacherium; *Spicilegii*, tom. iii. p. 38.

[*c*] 2 *Timothy* iii. 1.

The pride and arrogance of the Mendicants.

XXIX. While the pontifs accumulated upon the Mendicants the moſt honourable diſtinctions, and the moſt valuable privileges which they had to beſtow, they expoſed them ſtill more and more to the envy and hatred of the reſt of the clergy; and this hatred was conſiderably increaſed by the audacious arrogance that diſcovered itſelf every where in the conduct of theſe ſupercilious orders. They had the preſumption to declare publicly that they had a divine impulſe and commiſſion to illuſtrate and maintain the religion of JESUS; they treated with the utmoſt inſolence and contempt all the different ranks and orders of the prieſthood; they affirmed, without a bluſh, that the true method of obtaining ſalvation was revealed to them alone, proclaimed with oſtentation the ſuperior efficacy and virtue of their *indulgences*, and vaunted, beyond meaſure, their intereſts at the court of heaven, and their familiar connexions with the ſupreme Being, the Virgin MARY, and the ſaints in glory. By theſe impious wiles they ſo deluded and captivated the miſerable and blinded multitude, that they would not entruſt any others but the Mendicants with the care of their ſouls, their ſpiritual and eternal concerns [*e*]. We may give, as a ſpecimen of theſe notorious frauds, the ridiculous fable which the Carmelites impoſe upon the credulous, relating to SIMON STOCKIUS, the general of their order, who died about the beginning of this century. To this eccleſiaſtic, they tell us that the Virgin MARY appeared, and gave him a ſolemn promiſe, that the ſouls of ſuch, as left the world with the Carmelite cloak or *ſcapulary* upon their ſhoulders, ſhould be infallibly preſerved from eternal damnation [*f*]. And here let it be obſerved to the aſtoniſhment of all, in whom the power of ſuperſtition has not extinguiſhed the plaineſt dictates of common ſenſe, that this fiction, ridiculous, and impious as it was, found patrons and defenders even among the pontifs [*g*].

[*d*] The doctors of the univerſity of *Paris* profeſs ſtill a high reſpect for the memory of St. AMOUR, eſteem his book, and deny obſtinately that he was ever placed in the liſt of *heretics*. The Dominicans, on the contrary, conſider him as a heretic of the firſt magnitude, if we may uſe that expreſſion. Such of his works as could be found were publiſhed in 4^{to}. in the year 1632, at *Paris* (though the title bears *Conſtantiæ*) by CORDESIUS, who has prefixed to them a long and learned Preface, in which he defends the reputation and orthodoxy of St. AMOUR in a triumphant manner. This learned editor, to avoid the reſentment and fury of the Mendicants, concealed his real name, and aſſumed that of JO. ALITOPHILUS. This did not, however, ſave his book from the vengeance of theſe friars, who obtained from LEWIS XIII, in the year 1633, an edict for its ſuppreſſion, which TOURON, a Dominican friar, has publiſhed in his *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 164.—For a farther account of the life of this famous doctor, ſee WADDING. *Annal. Minor*. tom. iii. p. 366.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 266.—NAT. ALEX. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Sæc. xiii. cap. iii. Art. vii. p. 95.—RICH. SIMON. *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccleſ. de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 345.

[*e*] See MATTHEW PARIS, *ad A.* 1246, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 607. 630, &c.

[*f*] See JO. LAUNOII *Lib. de Viſo Stockii Oper.* tom. ii. part. II. p. 379.—*Acta Sanctor.* tom. iii. *Menſis Maii ad diem* xvi.—THEOPH. RAYNAUDI *Scapulare Marianum*, tom. vii. Opp. p. 614.

[*g*] The late pope BENEDICT XIV, notwithſtanding his pretended freedom from ſuperſtition

Conteſts between the Dominicans and Franciſcans.

XXX. It is, however, certain, that the Mendicant orders, though they were conſidered, as the main pillars of the hierarchy, and the principal ſupports of the papal authority, involved the pontifs, after the death of DOMINIC and FRANCIS, in many perplexities and troubles, which were no ſooner diſpelled, than they were unhappily renewed; and thus the church was often reduced to a ſtate of imminent danger. Theſe tumults and perplexities began with the conteſts between the Dominicans and Franciſcans about pre-eminence, in which theſe *humble* monks loaded each other with the bittereſt invectives, and the ſevereſt accuſations both in their writings and their diſcourſe, and oppoſed each other's intereſts with all the fury of diſappointed ambition. Many ſchemes were formed, and various meaſures were employed for terminating theſe ſcandalous diſſenſions; but the root of the evil ſtill remained, and the flame was rather covered than extinguiſhed [*b*]. Beſides this, the Franciſcans were early divided among themſelves, and ſplit into ſeveral factions, which gathered ſtrength and conſiſtence from day to day, and not only diſturbed the tranquillity of the church, but ſtruck at the ſupreme juriſdiction and prerogatives of the Roman pontifs. And whoever conſiders with attention the ſeries of events that happened in the Latin church from this remarkable period, will be fully convinced, that the Mendicant orders, whether through imprudence or deſign we ſhall not determine, gave ſeveral mortal blows to the authority of the church of *Rome*, and excited in the minds of the people thoſe ardent deſires of a reformation in the church, which produced, in after times, ſuch ſubſtantial and ſuch glorious effects.

Inteſtine diviſions among the Franciſcans occaſioned by different explications of their rule.

XXXI. The occaſion of theſe inteſtine diviſions among the Franciſcans, was a diſpute about the preciſe meaning of their rule. Their founder and chief had made abſolute poverty one of their indiſpenſable obligations. The religious orders before his time were ſo conſtituted, that, though no ſingle monk had any perſonal property, yet the whole community, conſidered as one collective body, had poſſeſſions and revenues, from whence each individual drew the means of his ſubſiſtence. But the auſtere chief of the Franciſcans abſolutely prohibited both ſeparate and collective property to the monks of his order, and neither the individual nor the community were permitted to poſſeſs either fund, revenue, or any worldly goods [*i*]. This injunction appeared ſo ſevere to ſeveral of the Friars-minors, that they took the liberty to diſpenſe with it as ſoon as their founder was dead; and in this they were ſeconded by the Roman pontif, GREGORY IX, who, in the

---

and prieſtly fraud, has deigned to appear among the ſupporters of this groſs fiction, though he defends it with his uſual air of prudence and timidity, in his book *De Feſtis B. Mariæ Virg.* lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 472. tom. x. Opp. ed. *Rom.*

[*b*] See the *Alcoran des Cordeliers*, tom. i. p. 256. 266. 278, &c. LUC. WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iii. p. 380.

[*i*] The words of the rule itſelf relating to this point are as follow: C. vi. *Fratres ſibi nihil appropient, nec domum, nec locum, nec aliquam rem: ſed ſicut peregrini et advenæ in hoc ſæculo, in paupertate et humilitate famulantes Domino, vadant pro eleemoſyna confidenter* . . . . (*i. e.* let them be ſturdy beggars) . . . *Hæc eſt illa celſitudo altiſſimæ paupertatis, quæ vos cariſſimos meos fratres hæredes et reges regni cælorum inſtituit.*

year 1231, publiſhed an interpretation of this rule, which mitigated conſiderably its exceſſive rigor [*k*]. But this mitigation was far from being agreeable to all the Franciſcans; it ſhocked the auſtere monks of that order, thoſe, particularly, who were called the *Spiritual* [*l*], whoſe melancholy temper rendered them fond of every thing harſh and gloomy, and whoſe fanatical ſpirit hurried them always into extremes. Hence aroſe a warm debate, which Innocent IV decided, in the year 1245, in favour of thoſe, who were for mitigating the ſeverity of the rule in queſtion. By this decree of the pontif it was enacted, that the Franciſcan friars ſhould be permitted to poſſeſs certain places, habitations, goods and chattels, books, *&c.* and to make uſe of them, but that the *property* of all theſe things ſhould reſide in St. Peter, or the Roman church; ſo that without the conſent of the Roman pontif they might neither be ſold, changed, nor transferred under any pretext whatſoever. This edict was conſidered by the gloomy part of the order as a moſt pernicious depravation of their holy rule, and was, conſequently, oppoſed and rejected by them with indignation. Hence many of theſe *ſpiritual* mal-contents retired into the woods and deſarts, while others were apprehended by Crescentius, the general of the ſociety, and ſent into exile [*m*].

XXXII. The face of affairs was, however, ſoon changed in their favour, when, in the year 1247, John of *Parma*, was choſen general of the order. This famous eccleſiaſtic, who was zealouſly attached to the ſentiments of the *ſpiritual*, recalled them from their exile, and inculcated upon all his monks a ſtrict and unlimited obedience to the very letter of the rule that had been drawn up by St. Francis [*n*]. By this reform he brought back the order to its primitive ſtate, and the only reward he obtained for his zealous labours was to be accuſed as a rebellious heretic at the tribunal of the Roman pontif Alexander IV, in conſequence of which he was obliged to reſign his poſt. He had alſo the mortification to ſee the monks, who adhered to his ſentiments, caſt into priſon, which unhappy lot he himſelf eſcaped with great difficulty [*o*]. His ſucceſſor the famous Bonaventura, who was one of the moſt eminent ſcholaſtic divines of this century, propoſed ſteering a middle courſe between the two contending factions, having nothing ſo much at heart as to prevent an open ſchiſm. Nevertheleſs, the meaſures he took to reconcile the jarring parties, and to maintain a ſpirit of union in the order, were not attended with that degree of ſucceſs which he expected from them, nor were they ſufficient to hinder the leſs auſtere part of the Franciſcans from ſolliciting and obtaining, in the year 1247, from Alexander IV, a ſolemn renewal of the mild interpretation which Inno-

---

[*k*] This bull was publiſhed by Emmanuel Roderic, in his *Collectio privilegiorum regularium Mendicantium et non Mendicantium*, tom. i. p. 8.

[*l*] Luc. Waddingii *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 99. they were alſo called *Zelatores*, and *Cæſarians*, from their chief Cæsarius.

[*m*] Id. ibid. tom. iv. p. 128. & tom. iii. p. 171.

[*n*] Id. ibid. tom. iii. p. 171.

[*o*] Id. ibid. tom. iv. p. 4.

CENT IV had given of the rule of their founder [*p*]. On the other hand, the faction that adhered to the ſentiments of JOHN of *Parma*, maintained their cauſe with ſuch ſucceſs, that in an aſſembly of the order, held in the year 1260, the explication of INNOCENT was abrogated and annulled, eſpecially in thoſe points, wherein it differed from that which had been formerly given by GREGORY IX [*q*].

Another conteſt ariſes among the Franciſcans concerning the *Everlaſting Goſpel* of the abbot Joachim.

XXXIII. This diſpute concerning the true ſenſe of the rule of St. FRANCIS was followed by another of equal moment, which produced new and unhappy diviſions among the monks of that order. About the commencement of this century, there were handed about in *Italy* ſeveral pretended prophecies of the famous JOACHIM, abbot of *Sora* in *Calabria* [*r*], whom the multitude revered as a perſon divinely inſpired, and equal to the moſt illuſtrious prophets of ancient times. The greateſt part of theſe predictions were contained in a certain book, entitled, *The Everlaſting Goſpel*, and which was alſo commonly called, *The Book of Joachim* [*s*]. This JOACHIM, whether a real or fictitious perſon we ſhall not pretend to determine, among many other future events foretold the deſtruction of the church of *Rome*, whoſe corruptions he cenſured with the greateſt ſeverity, and the promulgation of a new and *more perfect goſpel* in *the age of the Holy Ghoſt*, by a ſett of poor and auſtere miniſters, whom God was to raiſe up, and employ for that purpoſe. For he divided the world into *three ages*, relative to the three diſpenſations of religion that were to ſucceed each other in it. The two *imperfect ages*, to wit, the age of the Old Teſtament, which was that of the

---

[*p*] This edict of ALEXANDER IV is publiſhed by WADDINGIUS, *Annal. Min.* tom. iv. p. 446. among the *Records*.

[*q*] The interpretation of GREGORY mitigated the rule of St. FRANCIS; but that of INNOCENT went much farther, and ſeemed to deſtroy its fundamental principles. See WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 128. The lamentable diviſions, that reigned among the monks of this famous order, are deſcribed, in an accurate and lively manner, by BONAVENTURA himſelf, in a letter, which is extant in the *Annals* now cited, *tom.* iv. p. 58.

[(*r*) The reſemblance that there is between the words *Sora* and *Flora*, has probably led Dr. MOSHEIM here into a ſlight miſtake. *Sora* is not in *Calabria*, but in the province of *Capua*. It muſt therefore have been *Flora*, that our author intended to write, as SPANHEIM, FLEURY, and the other eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians have done.]

[*s*] The MERLIN of the Engliſh, the MALACHY of the Iriſh, and NOSTRADAMUS of the French, thoſe pretended ſoothſayers, who, under the illuſory, or feigned perſuaſion of a divine impulſe, ſung, in uncouth verſe, the future revolutions of church and ſtate, are juſt what we may ſuppoſe the JOACHIM of the Italians to have been. Many predictions of this latter were formerly handed about, and are ſtill to be ſeen; nay, they have paſſed through various editions, and have been illuſtrated by the lucubrations of ſeveral commentators. It is not to be doubted, that JOACHIM was the author of various predictions, and that he, in a particular manner, foretold the reformation of the church, of which he might eaſily ſee the abſolute neceſſity. It is, however, certain, that the greateſt part of the predictions and writings, which were formerly attributed to him, were compoſed by others; and this we may affirm even of the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, the work, undoubtedly, of ſome obſcure, ſilly, and viſionary author, who thought proper to adorn his reveries with the celebrated name of JOACHIM, in order to gain them credit, and to render them more agreeable to the multitude. The title of this ſenſeleſs production is taken from *Revelations* xiv. 6. and it contained three books, the firſt was entitled, *Liber Concordiæ veritatis*, i. e. *The Book of the Harmony of Truth*. The ſecond, *Apocalypſis Nova*, or *New Revelations*; and the third, *Pſalterium decem Chordarum*, i. e. *The Ten-ſtringed Harp*. This account was taken from a manuſcript of that work, in the library of the Sorbonne, by JAC. ECHARD, who has publiſhed it in his *Scriptores Dominic.* tom. i. p. 202.

Father, and the age of the New, which was under the adminiſtration of the Son, were, according to the predictions of this fanatic, now paſt, and the third age, even that of the *Holy Ghoſt*, was at hand. The *Spiritual*, i. e. the auſtere, Franciſcans, who were, for the moſt part, well-meaning, but wrong-headed enthuſiaſts, not only ſwallowed down, with the moſt voracious and implicit credulity, the prophecies and doctrines that were attributed to JOACHIM, but applied theſe predictions to themſelves, and to the rule of diſcipline eſtabliſhed by their holy founder St. FRANCIS [t]; for they maintained that he delivered to mankind the *true goſpel*, and that he was the angel whom St. JOHN ſaw flying in the midſt of heaven [u].

Gerhard's book condemned.

XXXIV. At the very time that the inteſtine diviſions among the Franciſcans were at the greateſt height, one of the *Spiritual* friars, whoſe name was GERHARD, undertook the explication of the *Everlaſting Goſpel* attributed to JOACHIM, in a book which appeared in the year 1250; under the title of *Introduction to the Everlaſting Goſpel* [w]. In this book the fanatical monk among other enormities, as inſipid as impious, inculcated the following deteſtable doctrine; "That St. FRANCIS, who was the angel mentioned in "the *Revelations* xiv. 6. had promulgated to the world the true and everlaſting goſpel of God; that the goſpel of CHRIST was to be abrogated in "the year 1260, and to give place to this new and everlaſting goſpel which "was to be ſubſtituted in its room; and that the miniſters of this great "reformation were to be humble and bare-footed friars, deſtitute of all "worldly emoluments [x]." When this ſtrange book was publiſhed at *Paris* in the year 1254, it excited in the doctors of the church, and, indeed, in all good men, the moſt lively feelings of horror and indignation againſt the Mendicant friars, who had already incurred the diſpleaſure of the public on other accounts. This univerſal ferment engaged the Roman pontif ALEXANDER IV, though much againſt his will, to order the ſuppreſſion of this abominable book in the year 1255; he, however, took care to have this order executed with the greateſt poſſible mildneſs, leſt it ſhould hurt the reputation of the Mendicants, and open the eyes of the ſuperſtitious multitude. But the univerſity of *Paris* was not ſatisfied with theſe gentle

---

[t] This is acknowledged even by WADDING, notwithſtanding his partiality in favour of the *ſpiritual* or auſtere Franciſcans. See his *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 3—6.

[u] *Revel.* xiv. 6. *And I ſaw another angel fly in the midſt of heaven, having the everlaſting goſpel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth*, &c.—See on this ſubject BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 221. 228. 235. 246.—ECHARDI *Scriptor. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 202.—*Codex Inquiſit. Tholoſanæ* a LIMBORCHIA edit. p. 301, 302, 305, &c.

[w] As the accounts given of this book, by ancient and modern writers, are not ſufficiently accurate, it may not be improper to offer here ſome obſervations that may correct their miſtakes. 1. They almoſt all confound the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, or *The Goſpel of the Holy Ghoſt*, (for ſo was it alſo called, as we are told by GUILL. DE ST. AMOUR, in his book *De Periculis noviſſ. Tempor.* p. 38.) with the *Introduction to the Everlaſting Goſpel*. But theſe two productions muſt be carefully diſtinguiſhed from each other. The *Everlaſting Goſpel* was attributed to the abbot JOACHIM, and it conſiſted in three books, as has been already obſerved. But the *Introduction* to this Goſpel was the work of a certain Franciſcan monk, who explained the obſcure predictions of the pretended Goſpel, and applied them to his order. The *Everlaſting Goſpel* was neither complained of by the univerſity of *Paris*, nor condemned by the Roman pontif ALEXANDER IV; but the *Introduction* was complained of, condemned, and burnt, as appears evidently from the letters of the abovementioned pontif, which are to be ſeen in BOULAY's *Hiſtor. Academ. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 292. The *former* conſiſted, as productions of that nature generally do, in ambiguous predictions, and intricate riddles and was conſequently deſpiſed, or neglected; but the *latter* was dangerous in many reſpects. 2. It is farther to be obſerved, that the ancient writers are not agreed concerning the author of this *Introduction*. They are unanimous in attributing it to one of the Mendicant friars; but the votaries of St. FRANCIS maintain, that the author was a Dominican; while the Dominican party affirm as obſtinately, that he was a Franciſcan. It is, however, certain, that the greateſt part of the learned are of opinion, that the author of the infamous work in queſtion was JOHN of *Parma*, general of the Franciſcans, who is known to have been moſt warmly attached to the *ſpiritual* faction of that order, and to have maintained the ſentiments of the abbot JOACHIM with an exceſſive zeal. See LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 9. who endeavours to defend him againſt this accuſation, though without ſucceſs. (See alſo the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iii. *Martii*, p. 157. for JOHN of *Parma*, though he preferred the *Goſpel* of St. FRANCIS to that of CHRIST, has, nevertheleſs, obtained a place among the ſaints.) The learned ECHARD is of a different opinion, and has proved, in his *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 202, 203. from the curious manuſcripts, yet preſerved in the Sorbonne, relating to the *Everlaſting Goſpel*, that GERHARD, a Franciſcan friar, was the author of the infamous *Introduction* to that book. This GERHARD, indeed, was the intimate friend and companion of JOHN of *Parma*, and not only maintained, with the greateſt obſtinacy, the cauſe of the *ſpiritual*, but alſo embraced all the ſentiments, that were attributed to the abbot JOACHIM with ſuch an ardent zeal, that he choſe to remain eighteen years in priſon, rather than to abandon them. See WADDINGII *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 4. 7. The Franciſcans, who were

---

called *obſervantes*, i. e. *vigilant*, from their profeſſing a more rigid obſervance of the rule of their founder than was practiſed by the reſt of their order, place GERHARD among the ſaints of the firſt rank, and impudently affirm, that he was not only endowed with the gift of prophecy, but alſo with the power of working miracles. See WADDINGII *Annales Min.* tom. iii. p. 213, 214. It is to be obſerved 3*dly*, That whoever may have been the writer of this deteſtable book, the whole Mendicant order, in the judgment of the greateſt part of the hiſtorians of this age, ſhared the guilt of its compoſition and publication, more eſpecially the Dominicans and Franciſcans, who are ſuppoſed to have fallen upon this impious method of deluding the multitude into a high notion of their ſanctity, in order thus to eſtabliſh their dominion, and to extend their authority beyond all bounds. This opinion, however, is ill founded, notwithſtanding the numbers by which it has been adopted. The Franciſcans alone are chargeable with the guilt of this horrid production, as appears moſt evidently from the fragments of the book itſelf, which yet remain; but we are obliged in juſtice to obſerve farther, that this guilt does not even lie upon all the Franciſcans, but only on that faction of the order, which is known under the title of the *Spiritual*. Perhaps we might go ſtill farther and alledge, that the charge ought not to be extended even to all the members of this faction, but to ſuch alone as placed an idle and enthuſiaſtic confidence in the abbot JOACHIM, and gave credit to all his pretended prophecies. Theſe obſervations are neceſſary to the true underſtanding of what has been ſaid concerning the *Everlaſting Goſpel* by the following learned men; JO. ANDR. SCHMIDIUS, *Singular. Diſſertat. Helmſt.* 1700, in 4to.—USSERIUS, *De Succeſſione Eccleſiar. Occident.* c. ix. § 20. p. 337.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 292.—NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ.* Sæc. xiii. Artic. iv. p. 78.—LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 9. Upon the whole it may be affirmed, that the book under conſideration is not, as the greateſt part of the learned have imagined, a monument of the arrogance of the Mendicant orders, but rather a proof of the impious fanaticiſm and extravagance of an handful of Franciſcans.

[x] See GUIL. DE ST. AMORE, *De Periculis noviſſ. Tempor.* p. 38, 39. who obſerves that the book, under conſideration, was not indeed publiſhed before the year 1254, but that the opinions contained in it had an earlier origin, and were propagated even in the year 1200. Several of the ancient writers have given large extracts from this infamous book, ſee HERM. CORNERI *Chronicon*, in ECCARDI *Corpore Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 850.—*Chronicon Egmondanum*, in ANT. MATTHÆI *Analectis veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 517.—RICOBALDUS apud ECCARDUM, *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 1215. But there is a great difference between theſe extracts, which ſeems to have ariſen from this, that ſome drew their citations from the *Everlaſting Goſpel of Joachim*, while others drew theirs from the *Introduction of Gerhard*, not ſufficiently diſtinguiſhing the one work from the other.

and timorous proceedings; and conſequently its doctors repeated without interruption their accuſations and complaints, until the infamous production, that had given ſuch juſt and general offence, was publicly committed to the flames [y].

The famous conſtitution of Nicolas III, relating to the rule of St. Francis.

XXXV. The inteſtine flame of diſcord, that had raged among the Franciſcans and was ſmothered, though not extinguiſhed by the prudent management of BONAVENTURA, broke out anew with redoubled fury after the death of that pacific doctor. The Franciſcan monks, who were fond of opulence and eaſe, renewed their complaints againſt the rule of their founder as unreaſonable and unjuſt, demanding what it was abſolutely beyond the power of man to perform. Their complaints, however, were without effect, and their ſchemes were diſconcerted by the Roman pontif NICOLAS III, who leaned to the ſide of the auſtere Franciſcans, and, in the year 1279, publiſhed that famous *conſtitution* which confirmed the rule of St. FRANCIS, and contained an accurate and elaborate explication of the maxims it recommended, and the duties it preſcribed [z]. By this edict the pontif renewed that part of the rule, that prohibited all kinds of property among the Franciſcans, every thing that bore the leaſt reſemblance of a legal poſſeſſion, or a fixed domain; but he granted to them, at the ſame time, the *uſe* of things neceſſary, ſuch as houſes, books, and other conveniencies of that nature, the property of which, in conformity with the appointment of INNOCENT IV, was to reſide in the church of *Rome*. Nor did the provident pontif ſtop here, but prohibited, under the ſevereſt penalties, all private explications of this new law, leſt they ſhould excite diſputes and furniſh new matter of contention, and reſerved the power of interpreting it to himſelf alone, and to his ſucceſſors in the pontificate [a].

Excites new troubles and exaſperates the *Spiritual*.

XXXVI. However diſpoſed NICOLAS was to ſatisfy the *Spiritual*, and auſtere part of the Franciſcan order, which was now become numerous both in *Italy* and *France*, and particularly in the province of *Narbonne*, the *conſtitution* above-mentioned was far from producing that effect. The monks of that gloomy faction that reſided in *Italy*, received the papal edict with a ſullen and diſcontented ſilence. Their brethren in *France*, and more eſpecially in the ſouthern parts of that kingdom, where the inhabitants are of a warm and ſanguine complexion, teſtified, in an open and tumultuous manner, their diſapprobation of this new *conſtitution*, and having at their head a famous Franciſcan, whoſe name was JEAN PIERRE D'OLIVE, they excited new diſſenſions and troubles in the order [b]. This PIERRE D'OLIVE was a native of *Serignan* in *Languedoc*, who had acquired a ſhining reputation by his writings, and whoſe eminent ſanctity and learning drew after him a great number of followers; nor is it to be denied, that there were many important truths and wiſe maxims in the inſtructions he delivered. One of the great objects, which he never loſt ſight of in his writings, was the corruption of the church of *Rome*, which he cenſured with a peculiar freedom and ſeverity in a work entitled, *Poſtilla*, or *A Commentary on the Revelations*, affirming boldly, that that church was repreſented by the *whore of Babylon, the mother of harlots*, whom St. JOHN beheld *ſitting upon a ſcarlet-coloured beaſt, full of names of blaſphemy, having ſeven heads, and ten horns* [c]. It is, however, to be obſerved, that this ſevere cenſor of a corrupt church was, himſelf, a moſt ſuperſtitious fanatic in ſeveral reſpects, having imbibed the greateſt part of thoſe monſtrous opinions, which the *Spiritual* pretended to have received from the abbot JOACHIM; to which he added an impious and extravagant veneration for St. FRANCIS whom he conſidered as wholly and *entirely transformed into the perſon of Chriſt* [d]. In the debate, concerning the ſenſe of the rule of this famous chief, he ſeemed to adhere to neither of the contending parties; for he allowed his followers the *bare uſe of the neceſſaries of life*, and being called upon, at different times, by the authority of his ſuperiors to declare his ſentiments upon this head, he profeſſed his aſſent to the interpretation, that had been given of the rule, in queſtion, by NICOLAS III. He leaned, nevertheleſs, to the ſide of thoſe auſtere and *Spiritual* Franciſcans, who not only oppoſed the introduction of property among the individuals of the order, but alſo maintained that the whole community, conſidered collectively, was likewiſe to be excluded from poſſeſſions of every kind. His zeal for theſe gloomy Franciſcans was great, and he defended their cauſe with warmth [e]; hence he is looked upon as the chief of that faction, which diſputed ſo often, and ſo vehemently, with the Roman pontifs in favour of the *renunciation of property*, in conſequence of the inſtitution of St. FRANCIS [f].

---

[y] See BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 299.—JORDANI *Chronicon*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 998.

[x] Some affirm, that this famous *Conſtitution* was iſſued out by NICOLAS IV; but their opinion is refuted by WADDING, in his *Annal. Min.* tom. v. p. 73.

[a] This conſtitution is yet extant in the *Jus Canon. Lib.* vi. *Decretal. Tit.* xii. c. iii. p. 1028. ed. *Böhmerianæ*, and is vulgarly called the *Conſtitution* EXIIT, from its beginning thus: *Exiit*, &c.

[b] In ſome ancient records this ring-leader is called *Petrus Bitterrenſis*, i. e. *Peter of Beziers*, becauſe he reſided for a long time in the convent of *Beziers*, where he performed the functions of a public teacher. By others, he is named PETRUS *de Serignano*, from the place of his nativity. This remark is ſo much the more neceſſary, as certain authors have taken theſe three denominations for three diſtinct perſons.

Continuation of theſe debates.

XXXVII. The credit and authority of PIERRE D'OLIVE, whom the multitude conſidered not only as a man of unblemiſhed ſanctity, but alſo as a prophet ſent from above, added new force and vigour to the *Spiritual*, and encouraged them to renew the combat with redoubled fury. But the prudence of the heads of the order prevented, for ſome time, the pernicious effects of theſe violent efforts, and ſo over-ruled the impetuous motions of this enthuſiaſtic faction, that a ſort of equality was preſerved between the contending parties. But the promotion of MATTHEW of *Aqua Sparta*, who was elected general of the order in the year 1287, put an end to theſe prudential meaſures, and changed entirely the face of affairs. This new chief ſuffered the ancient diſcipline of the Franciſcans to dwindle away to nothing, indulged his monks in abandoning even the very appearance of poverty, and thus drew upon him, not only the indignation and rage of the auſterer part of the *Spiritual* Franciſcans, but alſo the diſapprobation of the more moderate members of that party. Hence aroſe various tumults and ſeditions, firſt in the marquiſate of *Ancona*, and afterwards in *France*, which the new general endeavoured to ſuppreſs by impriſonment, exile, and corporal puniſhments; but, finding all theſe means ineffectual, reſigned his place in the year 1289 [g]. His ſucceſſor RAYMOND GOFFREDI employed his utmoſt efforts to appeaſe theſe troubles. For this purpoſe he recalled the baniſhed friars, ſet at liberty thoſe that had been caſt into priſon, and put out of the way ſeveral of the auſterer Franciſcans, who had been the principal fomenters of theſe unhappy diviſions, by ſending them into *Armenia* in the character of miſſionaries. But the diſorder was too far gone to admit of a remedy. The more moderate Franciſcans, who had a reliſh for the ſweets of property and opulence, accuſed the new general of a partial attachment to the *Spiritual*, whom he treated with peculiar affection and reſpect, and therefore employed their whole credit to get him removed from his office, which, with much difficulty, they, at length, effected under the pontificate of BONIFACE VIII. On the other hand, the more rigid part of the *Spiritual* faction renounced all fellowſhip, even with ſuch of their own party as diſcovered a pacific and reconciling ſpirit; and, forming themſelves into a ſeparate body, proteſted publicly againſt the interpretation which NICOLAS III had given of the rule of St. FRANCIS. Thus, from the year 1290, the affairs of the Franciſcans carried a diſmal aſpect, and portended nothing elſe than ſeditions, and ſchiſms in an order, that had been ſo famous for its pretended diſintereſtedneſs and humility [h].

---

[c] *Revelations* xvii. 3, 4, 5.

[d] *Totum* CHRISTO *configuratum.* See the *Littera Magiſtrorum de Poſtilla Fratris P. Joh. Olivi*, in BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 213.—WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. v. p. 51.

[e] The real ſentiments of PIERRE D'OLIVE will be beſt diſcovered in the laſt diſcourſe he pronounced, which is yet extant in BOULAY'S *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 535. and in WADDING'S *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 378.

[f] For an account of this famous friar, ſee not only the common monaſtic hiſtorians, ſuch as RAYNALDUS, ALEXANDER, and OUDINUS, but alſo the following: BALUZII *Miſcell.* tom. i. p. 213. and in *Vitis Pontiſ. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 752.—CAR. PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis Eccleſiæ Erroribus*, tom. i. p. 226.—WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 52. 108. 121. 140. 236. and more eſpecially p. 378, where he makes an unſucceſsful attempt to juſtify this enthuſiaſt.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 535.—SCHELHORNII *Amœnitates Litterariæ*, tom. ix. p. 678.—*Hiſtoire Generale de Languedoc, par les Moines Benedictins*, tom. iv. p. 91. 179. 182. The bones of PIERRE D'OLIVE were raiſed by the order of the Roman pontif JOHN XXII, and burnt publicly, with his writings, in the year 1325. See RAYNALD. *ad An.* 1325. § 20.

XXXVIII. In the year 1294, a certain number of Italian Franciſcans, of the *Spiritual* party, addreſſed themſelves to CELESTIN V, for a permiſſion to form a ſeparate order, in which they might not only profeſs, but alſo obſerve, in the ſtricteſt manner, that auſtere rule of abſolute poverty, which St. FRANCIS had preſcribed to his followers. The good pontif, who, before his elevation to the head of the church, had led a ſolitary and auſtere life [i], and was fond of every thing that looked like mortification and ſelf-denial, granted, with the utmoſt facility, the requeſt of theſe friars, and placed at the head of the new order a monk, whoſe name was LIBERATUS, and who was one of the greateſt *ſelf-tormentors* of all the monaſtic tribe [k]. Soon after this, CELESTIN, finding himſelf unfit for the duties of his high and important office, reſigned the pontificate, in which he was ſucceeded by BONIFACE VIII, who annulled every act that had been paſſed during the ſhort reign of his predeceſſor, and ſuppreſſed among other inſtitutions, the new order, which had aſſumed the title of the *Celeſtin Hermits of St. Francis* [l]. This diſgrace was, as it were, the ſignal, which drew upon them the moſt furious attacks of their enemies. The worldly-minded Franciſcans perſecuted them with the moſt unrelenting bitterneſs, accuſed them of various crimes, and ever caſt upon them the odious reproach of Manicheiſm. Hence many of theſe unhappy fanatics retired into *Achaia*, from whence they paſſed into a ſmall iſland, where they imagined themſelves ſecured from the rage of their adverſaries, and at liberty to *indulge* themſelves in all the auſterities of that miſerable life, which they looked upon as the perfection of holineſs here below. But no retreat was ſufficient to ſkreen them from the vigilance and fury of their cruel perſecutors, who left no means unemployed to perpetuate their miſeries. In the mean time, that branch of the *Spiritual* Franciſcans that remained in *Italy*, continued to obſerve the rigorous laws of their primitive inſtitution in ſpite of BONIFACE VIII, who uſed his utmoſt efforts to conquer their obſtinacy. They erected ſocieties of their order firſt in the kingdom of *Naples*, afterwards in the *Milaneſe*, and in the marquiſate of *Ancona*; and, at length, ſpreading themſelves through the greateſt part of *Europe*, they continued in the moſt violent ſtate of war with the church of *Rome*, until the face of things was changed by the reformation. In theſe conflicts they underwent trials and ſufferings of every kind, and multitudes of them periſhed in the flames, as miſerable victims to the infernal fury of the *Inquiſition* [m].

---

[g] WADDINGI *Annales Min.* tom. v. p. 210, 211. 235.

[h] Id. ibid. tom. v. p. 108. 121. 140. and more eſpecially p. 235, 236.

[i] This pope, whoſe name was PETER MEURON, had retired very young to a ſolitary mountain, in order to devote himſelf entirely to prayer and mortification. The fame of his piety brought many to ſee him from a principle of curioſity, ſeveral of whom renounced the world, and became the companions of his ſolitude. With theſe he formed a kind of community, in the year 1254, which was approved by URBAN IV, in 1264, and erected into a diſtinct order, called

The Hermits of St. Damien. Upon MEURON's elevation to the pontificate, and his aſſuming the name of CELESTIN V, his order, which muſt not be confounded with the new *Franciſcan Celeſtin Hermits*, took the title of *Celeſtins.*]

[k] WADDINGI *Annales*, tom. v. p. 324. 338.

[l] Id. ibid. tom. vi. p 1.—*Bullarium Magnum Contin.* III, IV. p. 108, 109.

[m] The writers, that ſerve generally as guides in this part of the hiſtory of the church, and whom I have been obliged to conſult upon the diviſions of the Franciſcans, whoſe hiſtory, as will ſoon appear, is peculiarly intereſting and important, are far from meriting the encomiums that are due to perſpicuity and exactneſs. This part of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of, what is called, the *Middle Age*, has not hitherto been accurately illuſtrated by any writer, though it be, every way, worthy of the labours of the learned, and of the attention of Chriſtians. Its principal merit conſiſts herein, that it exhibits ſtriking examples of piety and learning ſtruggling againſt the power of ſuperſtition and ignorance, and againſt that ſpiritual tyranny of which they were the principal ſupports. Nay, theſe very rebellious Franciſcans, though fanatical and ſuperſtitious in ſeveral reſpects, deſerve, nevertheleſs, an eminent rank among thoſe who prepared the way for the reformation in *Europe*, and who excited in the minds of the people a juſt averſion to the church of *Rome*. RAYNALDUS, BZOVIUS SPONDANUS, in their Annals, EYMERICUS, in his *Directorium Inquiſitorum*, and NATALIS ALEXANDER, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory relate the Revolutions, that happened in the Franciſcan order and in the church in general during this period; but their accounts are nei-

The Fratricelli and Beguards.

XXXIX. Towards the concluſion of this century, aroſe in *Italy* the enthuſiaſtic ſect of the *Fratricelli* and *Bizochi*, which, in *Germany* and *France*, received the denomination of *Beguards*. They were condemned by Boniface VIII [*n*], and by ſeveral of his ſucceſſors; and the *inquiſitors* were charged by theſe deſpotic pontifs to perſecute them until they were entirely extirpated, which commiſſion they executed with their uſual barbarity. The *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brethren*, were Franciſcan monks, who ſeparated themſelves from the grand community of St. Francis, with a deſign to obſerve, the laws of their parent and founder in a more ſtrict and rigorous manner than they were obſerved by the other Franciſcans; and who, accordingly, renounced every kind of poſſeſſion and property both common and perſonal, and begged from door to door their daily ſubſiſtance [*o*]. They alledged that neither Christ nor his apoſtles had any poſſeſſions

---

ther ſo accurate, nor ſo ample, as the importance of the events deſerved. And as it is from theſe authors that the proteſtant hiſtorians have drawn their materials, we need not be ſurprized at the defects with which theſe latter abound. Wadding, who merits the higheſt encomiums as a laborious and learned writer, is yet an uncertain guide, when he treats of the matters now under conſideration. His attachment to one party, and his fear of the others, lay him under reſtraints, that prevent his declaring the truth with a noble freedom. He ſhades his picture with dexterity. He conceals, diſſembles, excuſes, acknowledges, and denies, with ſuch a timorous prudence and caution, that the truth could not but ſuffer conſiderably under his pen. He appears to have been attached to the rigid Franciſcans, and yet had not the courage to declare openly that they had been injured by the pontifs. He ſaw, on the other hand, the tumults and perplexities in which theſe rigid Franciſcans had involved the church of *Rome*, and the ſtrokes they had levelled, with no ſmall ſucceſs, at the majeſty of the pontifs; but he has taken all imaginable pains to throw ſuch a ſhade upon this part of their conduct, as conceals its violence from the view of his readers. Such then being the characters of the writers, who have handed down to us the hiſtory of the church in this important period, I could follow none of them as a ſure or conſtant guide in all the events they relate, the judgments they form, or the characters they deſcribe. I have not, however, been deſtitute of a clue to conduct me through the various windings of this intricate labyrinth. The teſtimonies of ancient authors, with ſeveral manuſcripts that have never yet been publiſhed, ſuch as the *Diploma's* of the Pontifs and Emperors, the *Acts of the Inquiſition*, and other Records of that kind, are the authentic ſources from whence I have drawn my accounts of many things that have been very imperfectly repreſented by other hiſtorians.

[*n*] See Trithemius, *Annal. Hirſaug.* tom. ii. p. 74. though this author is defective in ſeveral reſpects, and more eſpecially in his accounts of the origin and ſentiments of the *Fratricelli*. It is alſo to be obſerved, that he confounds, through the whole of his hiſtory, the ſects and orders of this century one with another in the moſt ignorant and unſkilful manner. See rather Du Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 541. where the edict, publiſhed in the year 1297, by Boniface VIII, againſt the *Bizochi*, or *Beguards*, is inſerted; as alſo Jordani *Chronicon*, in Muratorii *Antiqq. Italiæ*, tom. iv. p. 1020.

[*o*] The *Fratricelli* reſemble the *Spiritual* in many of their maxims and obſervances: they, however, are a diſtinct body, and differ from them in various reſpects. The *Spiritual*, for inſtance, continued to hold communion with the reſt of the Franciſcans, from whom they differed in points of conſiderable moment, nor did they ever pretend to erect themſelves into a particular and diſtinct order; the *Fratricelli*, on the contrary, renounced all communion with the Franciſcans, and, withdrawing their obedience from the ſuperiors of that ſociety, choſe for themſelves a new chief, under whom they formed a new and ſeparate order. The *Spiritual* did not abſolutely oppoſe their order's poſſeſſing certain goods jointly, and in common, provided they renounced all property in theſe goods, and confined their pretenſions to the mere *uſe* of them; whereas the *Fratricelli* rejected every kind of poſſeſſion, whether perſonal or in common, and embraced that abſolute poverty and want, which St. Francis had preſcribed in his *Rule*, and in his laſt *Teſtament*. We omit the mention of other leſs important differences that might be alledged here.

CENT. XIII.

either *perſonal*, or *in common*, and that *they* were the models, whom St. FRANCIS commanded his followers to imitate. After the example alſo of their auſtere founder they went about cloathed with ſordid garments, or rather with loathſome rags, declaimed againſt the corruption of the church of *Rome*, and the vices of the pontifs and biſhops, foretold the reformation of the church, and the reſtoration of the true goſpel of CHRIST by the *genuine* followers of St. FRANCIS, and declared their aſſent to, almoſt, all the doctrines, which were publiſhed under the name of the abbot JOACHIM. They eſteemed and reſpected CELESTIN V, becauſe, as has been already obſerved, he was, in ſome meaſure, the founder of their ſociety, by permitting them to erect themſelves into a ſeparate order. But they refuſed to acknowledge, as true and lawful heads of the church, his ſucceſſor BONIFACE, and the other pontifs after him, who oppoſed the *Fratricelli*, and perſecuted their order [*p*].

[*p*] The accounts of the *Fratricelli*, that are given by ancient and modern writers, even by thoſe that pretend to the greateſt exactneſs, are extremely confuſed and uncertain. TRITHEMIUS, in his *Annal. Hirſaug.* tom. ii. p. 74. affirms, that they derived their origin from TANCHELINUS, and thus ignorantly confounds them with the *Cathariſts* and other ſects that aroſe in thoſe times. The Franciſcans leave no means unemployed to clear themſelves from all relation to this ſociety, and to demonſtrate, that ſuch a peſtilential and impious ſect, as that of the *Fratricelli*, did not derive their origin from the order of St. FRANCIS. In conſequence of this, they deny that the *Fratricelli* profeſſed the Franciſcan rule; and maintain, on the contrary, that the ſociety, which was diſtinguiſhed by this title, was a heap of rabble, compoſed of perſons of all kinds and all religions, whom HERMAN PONGILUP, towards the concluſion of this century, gathered together at *Ferrara* in *Italy*, and erected into a diſtinct order. See LUC. WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 279. This author employs all his eloquence to defend his order from the infamous reproach of having given riſe to that of the *Fratricelli*: But his efforts are vain; for he acknowledges, nay, even proves by unqueſtionable authorities, that this hated ſect profeſſed and obſerved, in the moſt rigorous manner, the rule of St. FRANCIS: and, nevertheleſs, he denies that they were Franciſcans; by which he means, and indeed can only mean, that they were not ſuch Franciſcans as thoſe, who lived in ſubjection to the general of the order, and adopted the interpretation which the pontifs had given of the rule of their founder. All WADDING's boaſted demonſtration, therefore, comes to no more than this, that the *Fratricelli* were Franciſcans, who ſeparated themſelves from the grand order of St. FRANCIS, and rejected the authority of the general of that order, and the laws and interpretations, together with the juriſdiction of the Roman pontifs; and this no mortal ever took it into his head to deny. HERMANNUS, or, as he is called by many, ARMANNUS PONGILUP, whom WADDING and others conſider as the parent of the *Fratricelli*, lived, in this century, at *Ferrara* in the higheſt reputation on account of his extraordinary piety; and when he died in the year 269, was interred with the greateſt magnificence and pomp in the principal church of that city. His memory was, for a long time, honoured with a degree of veneration equal to that which is paid to the moſt illuſtrious ſaints; and it was ſuppoſed that the ſupreme Being bore teſtimony to his eminent ſanctity by various miracles. But as PONGILUP had been ſuſpected of hereſy by the *Inquiſitors* *, on account of the peculiar auſterity of his life, which reſembled that of the *Cathariſts*, they made, even after his death, ſuch an exact and ſcrupulous inquiry into his maxims and morals, that, many years after he was laid low in the grave, his impiety was detected and publiſhed to the world. Hence it was, that, in the year 1300, his tomb was deſtroyed, his bones dug up, and burned by the order of BONIFACE VIII, and the multitude effectually cured of the enthuſiaſtic veneration they had for his memory. The *judicial acts* of this remarkable event are recorded by MURATORI, in his *Antiquit. Italic. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 93—147. and it appears evidently from them, that thoſe learned men, who conſider PONGILUP as the founder of the order of the *Fratricelli*, are entirely miſtaken. So far was he from being the founder of this ſect, that he was dead before it was in being. The truth of the matter is, that this famous enthuſiaſt was a *Cathariſt*, infected with *Paulician* or *Manichean* principles, and that he was a member of the ſect entitled *Bagnoliſts*, from a

* Theſe formidable cenſors were entitled, *Inquiſitors of Heretical Pravity*.

Tertiaries, Bocaſoti, and Beguins.

XL. As the Franciſcan order acknowledged, as its companions and aſſociates, a ſett of men who obſerved the *third rule* that was preſcribed by

town of that name in *Provence*, where they reſided. Some modern writers, indeed, have ſeen ſo far into the truth, as to perceive that the *Fratricelli* were a ſeparate branch of the rigid and auſtere Franciſcans; but they err in this, that they conſider them as the ſame ſect with the *Beguards* or *Beguins*, under a different denomination. Such is the opinion adopted by Limborch, in his *Hiſt. Inquiſit.* lib. i. cap. xix. p. 69. who appears to have been very little acquainted with the matters now under conſideration, by Baluzius, in his *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 195. & *Vit. Pontif. Avenionenſ.* tom. i. p. 509. by Beausobre, in his *Diſſertation concerning the Adamites*, ſubjoined to the *Hiſtory of the Wars of the Huſſites*, p. 380. and by Wadding, in his *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 376. But, notwithſtanding the authorities of theſe learned men, it is certain, as we ſhall ſhew in its place, that there was a real difference between the *Fratricelli* and the *Beguards*, not indeed with reſpect to their opinions, but in their rule of diſcipline and their manner of life.

The principal cauſe of the errors, that have obſcured the *Hiſtory of the Fratricelli*, is the ambiguity that there is in the denomination of their order. *Fratricellus*, *Fraterculus*, or *Little Brother*, was an Italian nick-name, or term of deriſion, that was applied in this century to all thoſe, who, without belonging to any of the religious orders, affected a monkiſh air in their cloathing, their carriage, and their manner of living, and aſſumed a ſanctimonious aſpect of piety and devotion. See Villani *Iſtorie Fiorentine*, lib. viii. c. 84. p. 423.—Imola *in Dantem*, p. 1121. in Muratori *Antiq. Ital.* tom. i. And as there were many vagabonds of this kind, that wandered about from place to place during this century, it happened, that this general term of *Fratricelli* was applied to them all, though they differed much from one another both in their opinions and in their methods of living. Thus the *Cathariſts*, the *Waldenſes*, the *Apoſtles*, and many other ſects, who had invented new opinions in religion, were marked with this denomination by the multitude; while the writers of foreign nations, unacquainted with this ludicrous application of the word, were puzzled in their inquiries after the ſect of the *Fratricelli*, who had given ſo much trouble to the Roman pontifs, nay, were led into the groſſeſt miſtakes, and imagined at one time, that this order was that of the *Cathariſts*, at another, that it was the ſect of the *Waldenſes*, &c. But, in order to have diſtinct ideas of this matter, it muſt be conſidered, that the word *Fraterculus*, or *Little Brother*, bore a quite different ſenſe from the ludicrous one now mentioned, when it was applied to the auſtere part of the Franciſcans, who maintained the neceſſity of obſerving, in the ſtricteſt manner, the rule of their founder. Inſtead of being a nick-name, or a term of deriſion when applied to them, it was an honourable denomination, in which they delighted, and which they preferred infinitely before all other titles. *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brothers*, is a word of the ſame ſignification with *Friars-minors*; and every one knows, that this latter appellation was adopted by the Franciſcans, as an expreſſion of their extraordinary humility and modeſty. In aſſuming this title therefore, theſe monks did not, properly ſpeaking, aſſume a new name, but only tranſlated the ancient name of their order into the Italian language; for what the Latins called *Fratres Minores*, i. e. *Friars-minors*, that the Italians called *Fratricelli*. Of the many proofs we might draw from the beſt authors in favour of this account of the matter, we ſhall only alledge one, from the *Life of Thomas Aquinas*, by Guilielmus de Thoco *in Actis Sanctor. Martii*, tom. i. cap. ii. § xxi. *Deſtruxit* (ſays that biographer) *et tertium peſtiferum pravitatis errorem S. Thomas . . . . cujus ſectatores, ſimul et inventores* SE NOMINANT FRATERCULOS DE VITA PAUPERE, *ut etiam ſub hoc humilitatis ſophiſtico nomine ſimplicium corda ſeducant . . . . Contra quem errorem peſtiferum Johannes Papa* XXII *mirandam edidit Decretalem.*

Now this very *Decretal* of John XXII against the *Fratricelli*, which Thoco calls *Admirable*, is, to mention no other teſtimonies, a ſufficient and ſatisfactory proof of what I have affirmed in relation to that ſect. In this Decretal, which is to be ſeen in the *Extravagantia Joh.* XXII. *Corporis Juris Canon.* tom. ii. p. 1112. ed. *Böhmerianæ*, the pontif expreſſes himſelf thus: *Nonnulli profanæ multitudinis viri, qui vulgariter Fratricelli ſeu Fratres de paupere vita, Bizochi ſive Beguini nuncupantur in partibus Italiæ, in inſula Siciliæ . . . . publice mendicare ſolent.* The pontif afterwards divides the *Fratricelli*, into *Monks* and *Tertaries*, or (which amounts to the ſame thing as we ſhall ſhew in its place) into *Fratricelli* and *Beguins*. With reſpect to the *Fratricelli*, properly ſo called, he expreſſes himſelf thus: *Plurimi regulam ſeu ordinem Fratrum Minorum . . . Se profiteri ad litteram conſervare confingunt, prætendentes ſe a ſanctæ memoriæ Cæleſtino Papa Quinto, prædeceſſore noſtro, hujus ſtatus, ſeu vitæ privilegium habuiſſe. Quod tamen, etſi oſtenderent, non valeret, cum Bonifacius Papa Octavus ex certis cauſis rationabilibus omnia ab ipſo Cæleſtino conceſſa . . . viribus penitus evacuaverit.* Here the

St. Francis, and were from thence commonly called *Tertiaries* [q]; ſo likewiſe the order of the *Fratricelli*, who were deſirous of being conſidered as the only genuine followers of St. Francis, had a great number of *Tertiaries* attached to their cauſe. Theſe *Tertiaries*, or half-monks, were called, in *Italy*, *Bizochi* and *Bocaſoti*: in *France*, *Beguins*, and in *Germany*, *Beguards*, or *Beghards*, which laſt was the denomination by which they were commonly known in almoſt all places [r]. They differed from the *Fratricelli*, not in their opinions and doctrine, but only in their manner of living.

---

pontif deſcribes clearly thoſe *Fratricelli*, who, ſeparating themſelves from the Franciſcans with a view to obſerve more ſtrictly the rule of St. Francis, were erected into a diſtinct order by pope Celestin V. And in the following paſſage he characteriſes, with the ſame perſpicuity, the *Bizochi* or *Beguins*, who entitled themſelves of *The third order of the penitents of St. Francis: Nonnulli ex ipſis aſſerentes ſe eſſe de tertio ordine beati Franciſci pœnitentium vocato, prædictum ſtatum et ritum eorum ſub velamine talis nominis ſatagunt palliare.*

[q] Beſides two very auſtere rules drawn up by St. Francis, the one for the *Friars-minors*, and the other for the *Poor Siſters*, called *Clariſſes*, from St. Clara their founder, this famous chief drew up a *third*, whoſe demands were leſs rigorous, for ſuch, as, without abandoning their worldly affairs, or reſigning their poſſeſſions, were, nevertheleſs, diſpoſed to enter, with certain reſtrictions, into the Franciſcan order, and deſirous of enjoying the privileges that were annexed to it. This rule preſcribed faſting, continence, hours of devotion and prayer, mean and dirty apparel, gravity of manners, and things of that nature, but neither prohibited contracting marriage, accumulating wealth, filling civil employments, nor attending to worldly affairs. All the Franciſcan hiſtorians have given accounts of this *third rule*, more eſpecially Wadding. *Annal. Min.* tom. ii. p. 7.—Helyot, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 214. They, that profeſſed this third rule, were called *Friars of the penance of Chriſt*, and ſometimes alſo, on account of the meanneſs of their garments, *Brethren of the Sack*, but they were more generally known by the denomination of *Tertiaries*. The greateſt part of the religious orders in the church of *Rome*, imitated this inſtitution of St. Francis, as ſoon as they perceived the various advantages, that were deducible from it. And hence, at this day, theſe orders continue to have their *Tertiaries*.

[r] The *Tertiaries*, that were connected with the order of the *Fratricelli*, aroſe about the year 1296, in the marquiſate of *Ancona* and the neighbouring countries, and were called *Bizochi*, as we learn from the edict iſſued out againſt them, in the year 1297, by Boniface VIII, and publiſhed by Du Boulay, in his *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 541. They are mentioned under the ſame title by John XXII, in the bull already cited. Add to all theſe authorities, that of the learned Du Fresne, who, in his *Gloſſar. Latinit. mediæ*, tom. i. p. 1188. obſerves, that this denomination is derived from *Bizochus*, which ſignifies in French *une Beſace*, i. e. a *ſack*, or *wallet*, ſuch as beggars in general, and theſe holy beggars in particular, were uſed to carry about with them. The term *Bocaſotus*, or *Vocaſotus*, as Du Boulay writes it (in his *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 510.) has no doubt the ſame origin, and bears the ſame ſignification. It is uſed by Jordan, in his *Chronicle*, from whence we ſhall cite a remarkable paſſage in the following note. The denominations of *Beghards* and *Beguins*, that were given to the *Tertiaries* in *France* and in *Italy*, are very frequently to be met with in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Middle Age. The accounts, however, which both ancient and modern writers generally give of theſe famous names, are ſo uncertain, and ſo different from each other, that we need not be ſurprized to find the hiſtory of the *Beghards* and *Beguins* involved in greater perplexity and darkneſs, than any other part of the Eccleſiaſtical Annals of the Age now mentioned. It is therefore my preſent deſign to remove this perplexity, and to diſpel this darkneſs, as far as that can be done in the ſhort ſpace to which I am confined, and to diſcloſe the true origin of theſe famous denominations.

The words *Beghard*, or *Beggehard*, *Begutta*, *Beghinus*, and *Beghina*, which only differ in their termination, have all one and the ſame ſenſe. The German and Belgic nations wrote *Beghard* and *Begutte*, which terminations are extremely common in the language of the ancient Germans. But the French ſubſtituted the Latin termination in place of the German, and changed *Beghard* into *Beghinus* and *Beghina*; ſo that thoſe, who in *Holland* and *Germany* were called *Beghard* and *Begutte*, were denominated in *France Beghini* and *Beghinæ*. Nay, even in *Germany* and *Holland*, the Latin termination was gradually introduced inſtead of the German, particularly in the feminine term

The *Fratricelli* were real monks, ſubjected to the rule of St. Francis: while the *Bizochi*, or *Beguins*, if we except their ſordid habit, and certain obſer-

---

Begutta, of which change we might alledge ſeveral probable reaſons, were this the proper place for diſquiſitions of that nature. There are many different opinions concerning the origin and ſignification of theſe terms, which it would be too tedious to mention, and ſtill more ſo to refute. Beſides, I have done this in a large work, now almoſt finiſhed, concerning the *Beghards* and *Beghines*, wherein I have traced out, with the utmoſt pains and labour, in Records, the greateſt part of which have never ſeen the light, the hiſtory of all the different ſects to whom theſe names have been given, and have, at the ſame time, detected the errors, into which many learned men have fallen in treating this part of the hiſtory of the church *. At preſent therefore, ſetting aſide many opinions and conjectures, I ſhall confine myſelf to a brief inquiry into the true origin and ſignification of theſe words. They are, undoubtedly, derived from the old German word *beggen*, *beggeren*, which ſignifies to *ſeek any thing with importunity, zeal, and earneſtneſs*. In joining to this word the ſyllable *hard*, which is the termination of many German words, we have the term *Beggehard*, which is applicable to a perſon who aſks any thing with ardor and importunity. And as none are ſo remarkable for aſking in this manner, as common beggars, who ſubſiſt upon the liberality of the public, therefore, in the ancient German language, they were called *Beghard*, from which the Engliſh word *beggar* is manifeſtly derived. *Begutta* ſignifies a female beggar.—When Chriſtianity was introduced into *Germany*, the word *beggen*, or *beggeren*, was uſed in a religious ſenſe, and expreſſed the act of devout and fervent prayer to the ſupreme Being. Accordingly we find, in the Gothic tranſlation of the Four Goſpels attributed to Ulphilas, the word *beggen* employed to expreſs the duty of *earneſt and fervent prayer*. Hence when any perſon diſtinguiſhed himſelf from others by the frequency and fervor of his devotional ſervices, he was called a *Beghard*, i. e. a *devout man*; and the denomination of *Begutta* was given, in the ſame ſenſe, to women of uncommon piety. And as they, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves from others by the frequency of their prayers, aſſume by that means a more ſtriking air of external devotion than the reſt of their fellow-chriſtians; hence it came to paſs, that all thoſe who were ambitious of appearing more religious and devout than their neighbours, were called *Beghardi*, or *Beguttæ*.

The obſervations we have hitherto made with reſpect to the origin and ſignification of the words in queſtion, will ſerve as a clue to deliver the attentive reader from that labyrinth of difficulties in which the hiſtory of the *Beghards* and *Beghinæ* has been involved. They will alſo enable him to account for the prodigious multitudes of *Beghards* and *Beguines* that ſprung up in *Europe* in the XIIIth century; and will ſhew him how it happened, that theſe denominations were given to above thirty ſects or orders, which differed widely from each other in their opinions, their diſcipline, and manner of living. The firſt and original ſignification of the word *Beghard* (or *Beggert*, as it was pronounced by the common people) was *importunate beggar*. Therefore when the people ſaw certain perſons, not only embracing with reſignation, but alſo with the moſt voluntary choice, and under a pretext of devotion, the horrors of abſolute poverty, begging their daily bread from door to door, and renouncing all their worldly poſſeſſions and occupations, they called all ſuch perſons *Beghards*, or, if they were women, *Beghurts*, without ever once conſidering the variety of opinions and maxims by which they were diſtinguiſhed. The ſect called *Apoſtles*, the rigid Franciſcans, the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, (of whom hereafter) all embraced this ſordid ſtate of beggary; and though among theſe orders there was not only the wideſt difference, but even the greateſt oppoſition, the Germans called them indiſcriminately *Beghards*, from the miſerable ſtate which they had all embraced. Nor is this to be wondered at; the character, which they poſſeſſed in common, was ſtriking; while the ſentiments and maxims that divided them, eſcaped the obſervation of the multitude.

But the word *Beghard* acquired a ſecond and a new ſignification in this century, being employed, as we have already obſerved, to ſignify a perſon who *prayed* with uncommon frequency, and who *diſtinguiſhed himſelf from thoſe about him by an extraordinary appearance of piety*. The force of this term, in its new ſignification, is the ſame with that of the word *Methodiſt*, which is at preſent the denomination of a certain ſett of fanatics in theſe kingdoms. Such therefore as departed from the manner of living that was uſual among their fellow-citizens, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the gravity of their aſpect, and the auſterity of their manners, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Beghards* and *Beguttes* in *Germany*, and of *Beguins* and *Beguines* in *France*. The

* The work here hinted at has not yet appeared, though we hope that thoſe who are entruſted with the papers of the learned author, will prevent ſuch a valuable production being loſt to the republic of letters.

vances and maxims, which they followed in conſequence of the injunctions of the famous ſaint now mentioned, lived after the manner of other men, and were therefore conſidered in no other light, than as *ſeculars* and *laymen* [s]. It is, however, to be obſerved, that the *Bizochi* were divided into two claſſes, which derived their different denominations of *perfect* and *imperfect*, from the different degrees of auſterity that they diſcovered in their manner of living. The *perfect* lived upon alms, abſtained from wedlock, and had no fixed habitations. The *imperfect*, on the contrary, had their houſes, wives, and poſſeſſions, and were engaged, like the reſt of their fellow-citizens, in the various affairs of life [t].

---

uſe of theſe terms was, at firſt, ſo extenſive, that, as we could ſhew by many examples, they were applied even to the monks themſelves; but, in proceſs of time, they were applied with leſs extent, and were confined to thoſe who formed a ſort of an intermediate order between the *monks* and *citizens*, and who reſembled the former in their manner of living, without aſſuming their name, or contracting their obligations. The *Tertiaries* therefore, or half-monks of the Dominican, Franciſcan, and, in general, of all the religious orders, were called *Beghards*; for though, as *lay-citizens*, they belonged to the body politic, yet they diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their monkiſh diſpoſitions, and their profeſſion of extraordinary piety and ſanctity of manners. The *Fraternity of weavers*, the *Brethren of St.* ALEXIUS, the *Followers of Gerhard the Great*, in a word, all who pretended to an uncommon degree of ſanctity and devotion were called *Beghards*, although they procured themſelves the neceſſaries of life by honeſt induſtry, without having recourſe to the ſordid trade of begging.

The denominations therefore of *Beghards*, *Beguttes*, *Beguins*, and *Beguines* are rather honourable than otherwiſe, when we conſider their origin; and they are mentioned as ſuch, in ſeveral records and deeds of this century, whoſe authority is moſt reſpectable, particularly in the Teſtament of St. LEWIS, king of *France*. But, in proceſs of time, theſe terms loſt gradually, as the caſe often happens, their primitive ſignification, and became marks of infamy and deriſion. For among theſe religious *beggars*, and theſe ſanctimonious pretenders to extraordinary piety, there were many, whoſe piety was nothing more than the moſt ſenſeleſs ſuperſtition, many alſo, whoſe auſtere devotion was accompanied with opinions of a corrupt nature, and entirely oppoſite to the doctrine of the church, and (what was ſtill more horrible) many artful hypocrites, who, under the maſk of religion, concealed the moſt abominable principles, and committed the moſt enormous crimes. Theſe were the fools and knaves, who brought the denomination of *Beghards* into diſrepute, and rendered it both ridiculous and infamous; ſo that it was only employed to ſignify idiots, heretics, or hypocrites. The denomination of *Lolhards*, of which we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more amply hereafter, met with the ſame fate, and was rendered contemptible by the perſons, who maſked their iniquity under that ſpecious title.

[s] See the *Acta Inquiſ. Tholoſ.* publiſhed by LIMBORCH, p. 298. 302. 310. 313. and particularly 307. 329. 382. 389, &c. Among the various paſſages of ancient writers, which tend to illuſtrate the hiſtory of the *Fratricelli* and *Beguins*, I ſhall quote only one, which is to be found in JORDAN's *Chronicon*, publiſhed by MURATORI, in his *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iv. p. 1020. and confirms almoſt every thing we have ſaid upon that head: *Anno* 1294, *Petrus de Maccrata et Petrus de Foroſemproneo Apoſtatæ fuerunt ordinis Minorum et hæretici. His petentibus eremitice vivere, ut Regulam B. Franciſci ad litteram ſervare poſſent. Quibus plures Apoſtatæ adhæſerunt, qui ſtatum communitatis damnabant et declarationes Regulæ, et vocabant ſe Fratres S. Franciſci* (he ought to have ſaid *Fratricellos*) *Sæculares* (i. e. the *Tertiaries*, who were the friends and aſſociates of the *Fratricelli*, without quitting, however, their ſecular ſtate, or entering into the monaſtic order). *Sæculares autem vocarunt Bizocios aut Fratricellos vel Bocaſotos* (here JORDAN is miſtaken, in affirming, that the *Sæculares* were called *Fratricelli*; for this latter name belonged only to the true monks of St. FRANCIS, and not to the *Tertiaries*. The other circumſtances of this account are exact, and ſhew that the more auſtere profeſſors of the Franciſcan rule were divided into two claſſes, *viz.* into *friars* and *ſeculars*, and that the latter were called *Bizochi*) *Ii dogmatizabant, quod nullus ſummus Pontifex Regulam B. Franciſci declarare potuit. Item, quod Angelus abſtulit a Nicolao tertio Papatus auctoritatem,* . . . *Et quod ipſi ſoli ſunt in via Dei et vera eccleſia*, &c.

[t] This diviſion is mentioned, or ſuppoſed by ſeveral authors, and more eſpecially in the *Acta Inquiſit. Tholoſanæ*, p. 303. 310. 312, 313. 319, &c.

A great difference between the Franciſcan Beguines and thoſe of Germany and the Netherlands.

XLI. We muſt not confound theſe *Beguins* and *Beguines*, who derived their origin from an auſtere branch of the Franciſcan order, with the German and Belgic *Beguines*, who crept out of their obſcurity in this century, and multiplied prodigiouſly in a very ſhort ſpace of time [*u*]. Their origin was of earlier date than this century, but it was only now that they acquired a name, and made a noiſe in the world. Their primitive eſtabliſhment was, undoubtedly, the effect of virtuous diſpoſitions and upright intentions. A certain number of pious women, both virgins and widows, in order to maintain their integrity, and preſerve their principles from the contagion of a vitious and corrupt age, formed themſelves into ſocieties, each of which had a fixed place of reſidence, and was under the inſpection and government of a female head. Here they divided their time between exerciſes of devotion, and works of honeſt induſtry, reſerving to themſelves the liberty of entering into the ſtate of matrimony, as alſo of quitting the convent, whenever they thought proper. And as all thoſe among the female ſex, who made extraordinary profeſſions of piety and devotion, were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Beguines*, i. e. perſons who were uncommonly *aſſiduous in prayer*, that title was given to the women of whom we are now ſpeaking [*w*]. The firſt ſociety of this kind, that we read of, was formed at *Nivelle* in *Brabant*, in the year 1226 [*x*]; and was followed by ſo many inſtitutions of a like nature in *France*, *Germany*, *Holland*, and *Flanders*, that, towards the middle of the XIIIth century, there was ſcarcely a city of any note, that had not its *beguinage*, or *vineyard*, as it was ſometimes called in conformity to the ſtyle of the *Song of Songs* [y]. All theſe female ſocieties were not governed by the ſame laws: but, in the greateſt part of them, the hours, that were not devoted to prayer, meditation, or other religious exerciſes, were employed in weaving, embroidering, and other manual labours of various kinds. The poor, ſick, and diſabled *Beguines* were ſupported by the pious liberality of ſuch opulent perſons as were friends to the order.

[*u*] In the laſt century there was a great debate carried on in the Netherlands concerning the origin of the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, of which I have given an ample account in a work not yet publiſhed. In the courſe of this controverſy the *Beguines* produced the moſt authentic and unexceptionable records, and diplomas, from which it appeared, that ſo early as the XI and XIIth centuries, there had been ſeveral ſocieties of *Beguines* eſtabliſhed in *Holland* and *Flanders*. It is true, they had no more than three of theſe authentic acts to offer as a proof of their antiquity; the firſt was drawn up in the year 1065, the ſecond in the year 1129, the third in 1151, and they were all three drawn up, at *Vilvorden*, by the *Beguines*, who, at that time, were ſettled there. See AUB. MIRÆI *Opera Diplomatico-hiſtorica*, tom. ii. c. 26. p. 948. and tom. iii. p. 628. edit. *Nov.*—ERYCIUS PUTEANUS, *De Beghinarum apud Belgas inſtituto et nomine ſuffragio*. This treatiſe of PUTEANUS is to be found with another of the ſame author and upon the ſame ſubject, in a work entitled, JOSEPHI GELDOLPHI a RYCKEL *Vita S. Veggæ cum Adnotationibus*, p. 65—227. *Duaci* 1631, in 4to. Now, though we grant that thoſe writers are miſtaken, who place the firſt riſe of the *Beguines* in the XII or XIIIth century, yet the ſmall number of authentic records, which they have to produce in favour of their antiquity, is an inconteſtable proof of the obſcurity, in which they lay concealed, before the time in which theſe writers place their origin, and may render it almoſt probable, that the only *convent of Beguines*, that exiſted before the XIIIth century, was that of *Vilvorden* in *Brabant*.

[*w*] All the *Beghards* and *Beguines* that yet remain in *Flanders* and *Holland*, where their convents have almoſt entirely changed their ancient and primitive form, affirm unanimouſly, that both their name and inſtitution derive their origin from St. BEGGHE, dutcheſs of *Brabant*, and daughter of PEPIN, mayor of the palace to the king of *Auſtraſia*, who lived in the VIIth century. This lady, therefore, they conſider as their patroneſs, and honour her as a kind of tutelary divinity with the deepeſt ſentiments of veneration and reſpect. See JOS. GELD a RYCKEL *in Vita S. Beggæ cum Adnotat. Duaci et Lovanii edita*, a work of great bulk and little merit, and full of the moſt ſilly and inſipid fables.—Thoſe, who are no well-wiſhers to the cauſe of the *Beguines*, adopt a quite different account of their origin, which they deduce from LAMBERT LE BEGUE, a prieſt and native of *Liege*, who lived in the XIIth century, and was much eſteemed on account of his eminent piety. The learned PETER COENS, canon of *Antwerp*, has defended this opinion with more erudition than any other writer, in his *Diſquiſitio Hiſtorica de Origine Beghinarum et Beghinagiorum in Belgio*, *Leod.* 1672, in 12mo.

[(*x*) Other hiſtorians ſay, in the year 1207.]

Beghards or Lollards.

XLII. This female inſtitution was ſoon imitated in *Flanders* by the other ſex; and conſiderable numbers of unmarried men, both batchelors and widowers, formed themſelves into communities of the ſame kind with thoſe of the *Beguines*, under the inſpection and government of a certain chief, and with the ſame religious views and purpoſes; ſtill, however, reſerving to themſelves the liberty of returning to their former method of life [z]. Theſe pious perſons were, in the ſtyle of this age, called *Beghards*, and, by a corruption of that term uſual among the Flemiſh and Dutch, *Bogards*; from others they received the denomination of *Lollards*; in *France* they were diſtinguiſhed at firſt by that of *Bons Valets*, or *Bons Garçons*, and afterwards by that of *Beguins*; they were alſo called the *Fraternity of weavers*, from the trade, which the greateſt part of them exerciſed. The firſt ſociety of the *Beghards* ſeems to have been that which was eſtabliſhed at *Antwerp* in the year 1228, and continues ſtill in a flouriſhing ſtate; though the *brethren*, of whom it is compoſed, have long ſince departed from their primitive rule of diſcipline and manners. This firſt eſtabliſhment of the *Beghards* was followed by many more in *Germany*, *France*, *Holland*, and *Flanders*; though, after all their ſucceſs, their congregations were leſs numerous than thoſe of the *Beguines* [a]. It is worthy of obſervation, that the Roman pontifs never honoured the ſocieties of the *Beghards* and *Beguines* with their ſolemn or explicit approbation, nor confirmed their eſtabliſhments by the ſeal of their authority. They, however, granted them a full toleration, and even defended them often againſt the ſtratagems and violence of their enemies, who were many in number. This appears by the edicts in favour of the *Beghards*, which the pontifs granted in compliance with the earneſt ſollicitations of many illuſtrious perſonages, who wiſhed well to that ſociety. It did not, however, continue always in a flouriſhing ſtate. The greateſt part of the convents, both of the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, are now either demoliſhed, or converted to other uſes. In *Flanders*, indeed, a conſiderable number of the latter ſtill ſubſiſt, but few of the former are to be found any where.

---

[y] See MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major, ad An.* 1243 & 1250, p. 540. 696.—THOMAS CANTIPRATENSIS *in Bono Univerſali de Apibus*, lib. ii. cap. li. p. 478. edit. *Colvenerii*.—PETRUS DE HERENTHAL, in his *Annals*, from which, though they are not yet publiſhed, we have a very remarkable paſſage cited by JOS. GELDOLPH. a RYCKEL, in his *Obſervationes ad Vitam S. Beggæ*, § cxcvi. p. 355. The origin and charters of the convents of Beguines, that were founded during this and the following century in *Holland* and *Flanders*, are treated in an ample manner by AUB. MIRÆUS, in his *Opera Hiſtorico-diplomatica*, JOHN BAPT. GRAMMAYE, in his *Antiquitates Belgicæ*, ANTON. SANDERS, in his *Brabantia et Flandria illuſtrata*, and by the other writers of Belgic hiſtory.

[z] MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſt. Major, ad An.* 1253, p. 539, 540.

[a] See RYCKELII *Vita S. Beggæ*, p. 635.—ANT. SANDERII *Flandria Illuſtrata*, lib. c. xvi. p. 136.—JO. BAPT. GRAMMAYEI *Antiquit. Fland. & in Gandavo*, p. 22.—AUB. MIRÆI *Opera Diplom. Hiſt.* tom. iii. c. 168. p. 145.—HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. vii. p. 248. who is, nevertheleſs, chargeable with many errors.—GERHARDUS ANTONINUS *Pater Miniſter* (ſo the head of the order is called in our times) *Beghardorum Antwerpienſium in Epiſtola ad Ryckium de Beghardorum origine et fatis*, in RYCKELII *Vita S. Beggæ*, p. 489. This author, indeed, from a ſpirit of partiality to his order, conceals the truth deſignedly in various places.

Greek writers.

XLIII. After the accounts hitherto given of the rulers of the church, and of the monaſtic and other religious orders that were inſtituted, or became famous during this century, it will not be improper to conclude this chapter by mentioning briefly the Greek and Latin writers, who, during the ſame period, acquired a name by their learned productions. The moſt eminent among the Greeks were

Nicetas Acominatus, who compoſed a work entitled, *The Hiſtory and Treaſure of the Orthodox Faith*;

Germanus, the Grecian patriarch, of whom we have yet extant, among other productions of leſs note, *A Book againſt the Latins*, and *An Expoſition of the Greek Liturgy*;

Theodorus Lascaris, who left behind him ſeveral treatiſes upon various ſubjects of a religious nature, and who alſo entered the liſts againſt the Latins, which was the reigning paſſion among all the Greeks, who were endowed with any tolerable parts, and who were deſirous of ſhewing their zeal for the honour of their nation;

Nicephorus Blemmida, who employed his talents in the ſalutary work of healing the diviſions between the Greeks and Latins;

Arsenius, whoſe *Synopſis of the Canon Law of the Greeks*, is far from being contemptible;

Georgius Acropolita, who acquired a high degree of renown, not only by his hiſtorical writings, but alſo by the tranſactions and negociations in which he was employed by the emperor Michael;

Johannes Beccus, or Veccus, who involved himſelf in much trouble, and made himſelf many enemies, by defending the cauſe of the Latins againſt his own nation with too much zeal;

George Metochita, and Constantine Meliteniota, who employed, without ſucceſs, their moſt earneſt efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

George Pachymeres, who acquired a name by his commentary upon Dionysius, the pretended chief of the myſtics, and by a hiſtory which he compoſed of his own time; and

George the *Cyprian*, whoſe hatred of the Latins, and warm oppoſition to Veccus above-mentioned, rendered him more famous than all his other productions [*b*].

[*b*] For a more ample account of all theſe writers the reader may conſult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius.

XLIV. The

Latin writers.

XLIV. The prodigious number of Latin writers that appeared in this century renders it impoſſible for us to mention them all; we ſhall therefore confine our account to thoſe among them, who were the moſt eminent, and whoſe theological writings demand moſt frequently our notice in the courſe of this hiſtory. Such are,

JOACHIM, abbot of *Flora* in *Calabria*, who, though eſteemed on account of his piety and knowledge, was, nevertheleſs, a man of mean parts and of a weak judgment, full of enthuſiaſtic and viſionary notions, and therefore conſidered, during his life and after his death, by the miſerable and blinded multitude, as a prophet ſent from above. The pretended prophecies of this ſilly fanatic are abundantly known, and have been frequently publiſhed [c];

STEPHEN LANGTON, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who wrote commentaries upon the greateſt part of the books of ſcripture [d];

FRANCIS, the founder of the famous ſociety of *Friars-minors*, or *Franciſcans*, whoſe writings were deſigned to touch the heart, and excite pious and devout ſentiments, but diſcover little genius, and leſs judgment;

ALAN DE L'ISLE, a logician, who made no mean figure among that diſputatious tribe, who applied himſelf alſo to the ſtudy of chemiſtry, and publiſhed ſeveral moral diſcourſes, in which there are many wiſe and uſeful exhortations and precepts [e];

JACOBUS DE VITRIACO, who acquired a name by his *Oriental Hiſtory*; and JACOBUS DE VORAGINE, whoſe *Hiſtory of the Lombards* [f], was received with applauſe.

The writers of this century, who obtained the greateſt renown on account of their laborious reſearches in, what was called, philoſophical or dialectical theology, were, ALBERTUS MAGNUS, THOMAS AQUINAS, and BONAVENTURA, who were, each of them, truly poſſeſſed of an inquiſitive turn of mind, a ſublime and penetrating genius, accompanied with an uncommon talent of ſounding the moſt hidden truths, and treating with facility the moſt abſtruſe ſubjects, though they are all chargeable with errors and reveries that do little honour to their memories [g]. The other writers, who trod the ſame intricate paths of metaphyſical divinity, were many in number, and ſeveral of them juſtly admired, though much inferior in renown to the celebrated triumvirate now mentioned; ſuch were ALEXANDER DE HALES, the interpreter of ARISTOTLE, WILLIAM of *Paris* [*b*], ROBERT CAPITO [*i*], THOMAS CANTIPRATENSIS, JOHN DE PECKHAM, WILLIAM DURAND, ROGER BACON [*k*], RICHARD MIDDLETON, ÆGIDIUS DE COLUMNA, ARMAND DE BELLO VISU, and ſeveral others.

---

[c] The life of JOACHIM was written in Italian by GREGORY DI LAURO, and publiſhed in 4to at *Naples* in the year 1660. The firſt edition of his prophecies was printed at *Venice* in the year 1517, and was followed by ſeveral new editions to ſatisfy the curioſity of the populace, great and ſmall.

[(d) LANGTON was a learned and polite author for the age he lived in. It is to him we are indebted for the diviſion of the Bible into chapters. He wrote *Commentaries* upon all the *Books of the Old Teſtament*, and upon *St. Paul's Epiſtles*.]

[e] Several of the name of ALAN, lived in this century, who have been ſtrangely confounded both by ancient and modern writers. See JAQ. LE BOEUF, *Memoires ſur l'Hiſt. d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 300. & *Diſſert. ſur l'Hiſt. Civil. et Eccleſ. de Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 293.

[f] JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Domin.* tom. i. p. 454.—BOLLANDI *Præf. ad Acta Sauctor.* tom. i. p. 9.

[g] For an account of ALBERT, ſee ECHARD. *Script. Dom.* tom. i. p. 162.—For an account of THOMAS AQUINAS, who was called the *Angel of the ſcolaſtics* among other ſplendid titles, ſee the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. *Martii*, p. 655. & ANT. TURON, *Vie de St. Thomas, Paris* 1737, in 4to.—We have alſo a circumſtantial relation of whatever concerns the life, writings, and exploits of

HUGO DE St. CARO gained much applauſe by the *Concordance*, which he compoſed of the *Holy Bible* [*l*].

GUILLAUME DE St. AMOUR, carried on with great ſpirit and reſolution, but with little ſucceſs, a literary and theological war againſt the Mendicant friars, who looked upon begging as a mark of ſanctity.

HUMBERT DE ROMANIS drew up a ſyſtem of rules and precepts with a view to put under a better regulation the lives and manners of the monaſtic orders.

GUILIELMUS PERALDUS aroſe in this century to the higheſt degree of literary renown in conſequence of a ſyſtem of morals he publiſhed under the title of *Summa Virtutum et Vitiorum* [*m*].

RAIMOND MARTIN yet ſurvives the oblivion that has covered many of his cotemporaries, and his *Pugio Fidei*, or *Sword of Faith*, which he drew againſt the Jews and Saracens, has eſcaped the ruins of time.

JOHN of PARIS deſerves an eminent rank among the glorious defenders of truth, liberty, and juſtice; ſince he maintained the authority of the civil powers, and the majeſty of kings and princes, againſt the ambitious ſtratagems and uſurpations of the Roman pontifs, and declared openly his oppoſition to the opinion that was commonly adopted with reſpect to the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper and the preſence of CHRIST in that holy ordinance [*n*].

BONAVENTURA, the tutelary ſaint of the *Lionnois* in *France*, in the two following books, *viz.* COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 307.—and the *Hiſtoire de la Vie et du Culte de S. Bonaventure par un Religieux Cordelier, à Lyon*, 1747, in 8^vo^.

[*b*] See the *Gallia Chriſtiana*, publiſhed by the Benedictines, *tom.* vii. p. 95.

[*i*] The learned ANTHONY WOOD has given an ample account of ROBERT CAPITO, in his *Antiquitat. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 81. 105.

[(*k*) We are ſurprized to find ROGER BACON thruſt here into a crowd of vulgar *literati*, ſince that great man, whoſe aſtoniſhing genius and univerſal learning have already been taken notice of, was, in every reſpect, ſuperior to ALBERT and BONAVENTURA, two of the heros of Dr. MOSHEIM's triumvirate.]

[(*l*) HUGO DE ST. CARO, or *St. Cher*, compoſed alſo a very learned collection of the various readings of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuſcripts of the Bible. This work, which he entitled *Correctorium Bibliæ*, is preſerved in manuſcript in the Sorbonne library. We muſt not forget to obſerve alſo that his *Concordance* is the firſt that ever was compiled.]

[*m*] See COLONIA, *Hiſtoire Litt. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 322.

[*n*] We may learn his opinion concerning the euchariſt from his treatiſe, entitled, *Determinatio de S. Coena*, and publiſhed in 8^vo^ at *London*, by the learned Dr. ALIX, in the year 1686.—See alſo ECHARDI *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 501.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionenſ.* tom. i. p. 4. 576, 577.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church during this century.

The general ſtate of religion.

I. HOWEVER numerous and deplorable the corruptions and ſuperſtitious abuſes were that had hitherto reigned in the church, and deformed the beautiful ſimplicity of the goſpel, they were nevertheleſs increaſed in this century, inſtead of being reformed, and the religion of CHRIST continued to ſuffer under the growing tyranny of fanaticiſm and ſuperſtition. The progreſs of reaſon and truth was retarded among the Greeks and Orientals by their immoderate averſion to the Latins, their blind admiration of whatever bore the ſtamp of antiquity, the indolence of their biſhops, the ſtupidity of their clergy, and the calamities of the times. Among the Latins many concurring cauſes united to augment the darkneſs of that cloud that had already been caſt over the divine luſtre of genuine Chriſtianity. On the one hand, the Roman pontifs could not bear the thoughts of any thing that might have the remoteſt tendency to diminiſh their authority, or to encroach upon their prerogatives; and therefore they laboured aſſiduouſly to keep the multitude in the dark, and to blaſt every attempt that was made towards a reformation in the doctrine or diſcipline of the church. On the other hand, the ſchool-divines, among whom the Dominicans and Franciſcan monks made the greateſt figure on account of their unintelligible jargon and ſubtilty, ſhed perplexity and darkneſs over the plain truths of religion by their intricate diſtinctions, and endleſs diviſions, and by that cavilling, quibbling, diſputatious ſpirit, that is the mortal enemy both of truth and virtue. It is true, that theſe ſcholaſtic doctors were not all equally chargeable with corrupting the truth; the moſt enormous and criminal corruptors of Chriſtianity were thoſe who led the multitude into the two following abominable errors: that it was in the power of man to perform, if he pleaſed, a more perfect obedience than God required, and that the whole of religion conſiſted in an external air of gravity, and in certain compoſed bodily geſtures.

New articles of faith impoſed by Innocent III.

II. It will be eaſy to confirm this general account of the ſtate of religion by particular facts. In the IV council of the Lateran that was held by INNOCENT III, in the year 1215, and at which ſuch a prodigious number of eccleſiaſtics were aſſembled [o], that imperious and inſolent pontif, without deigning to conſult any body, publiſhed no leſs than ſeventy laws or decrees, by which not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but alſo new doctrines, or *articles of faith*, were impoſed upon Chriſtians. Hitherto the opinions of the Chriſtian doctors, concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of CHRIST were *preſent* in the euchariſt, were extremely different, nor had the church determined by any clear and poſitive decree the ſentiment that was to be embraced in relation to that important matter. It was reſerved for INNO-

---

[(o) At this council there were preſent 412 biſhops, 800 abbots and priors, beſides the ambaſſadors of almoſt all the European princes.]

CENT to put an end to the liberty, which every Chriſtian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this preſence in the manner he thought moſt agreeable to the declarations of ſcripture, and to decide in favour of the moſt monſtrous doctrine, that the frenzy of ſuperſtition was capable of inventing. This audacious pontif pronounced the opinion that is embraced at this day in the church of *Rome* relating to that point, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter, and he *had the honour* of introducing and eſtabliſhing the uſe of the term *Tranſubſtantiation*, which was hitherto abſolutely unknown [*p*]. The ſame pontif placed, by his own authority, among the duties preſcribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confeſſion* to a prieſt; a confeſſion that implied not only a general acknowledgement, but alſo a particular enumeration of the ſins and follies of the penitent. Before this period ſeveral doctors, indeed, looked upon this kind of *confeſſion*, as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the church. For though the confeſſion of ſins was juſtly looked upon as an eſſential duty, yet it was left to every Chriſtian's choice, to make this confeſſion mentally to the ſupreme Being, or to expreſs it in words to a ſpiritual confident and director [*q*]. Theſe two laws, which, by the authority of INNOCENT, were received as laws of God, and adopted, of conſequence, as laws of the church, occaſioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the ſmalleſt traces are to be found in the ſacred writings, or in the apoſtolic and primitive ages, and which were much more adapted to eſtabliſh and extend the reign of ſuperſtition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuſes of which it had been the ſource.

The ſect of the Flagellantes, or Whippers.

III. There is nothing that will contribute more to convince us of the miſerable ſtate of religion in this century, and of the frenzy that almoſt generally prevailed in the devotion of theſe unhappy times, than the riſe of the ſect, called *Flagellantes*, or *Whippers*, which ſprung up in *Italy* in the year 1260, and was propagated from thence through almoſt all the countries of *Europe*. The ſocieties, that embraced this new diſcipline, preſented the moſt hideous and ſhocking ſpectacle, that can well be conceived; they ran in multitudes, compoſed of perſons of both ſexes, and of all ranks and ages; through the public places of the moſt populous cities, and alſo through the fields and deſarts, with whips in their hands, laſhing their naked bodies with the moſt aſtoniſhing ſeverity, filling the air with their wild ſhrieks, and beholding the firmament with an air of diſtraction, ferocity, and horror, and all this with a view to obtain the divine mercy for themſelves, and others by their voluntary mortification and penance [*r*]. This method of appeaſing the Deity was perfectly conformable to the notions concerning religion that generally prevailed in this century; nor did theſe fanatical

---

[*p*] See EDM. ALBERTINUS, *De Euchariſtia*, lib. iii. p. 972.

[*q*] See the book of the learned DAILLE, concerning *Auricular Confeſſion*.

[*r*] CHRIST. SCHÖTGENII *Hiſtoria Flagellantium*.—JAQUES BOILEAU, *Hiſtoire des Flagellans*, chap. ix. p. 253. We have alſo a lively picture of this fanatical diſcipline of the *Whippers*, exhibited in MARTENE's *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 105. with which the reader may compare MURATORI *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 469.

Whippers do any thing more, in this extravagant diſcipline, than practiſe the leſſons they had received from the monks, eſpecially from thoſe of the Mendicant orders. Hence they attracted the eſteem and veneration not only of the populace, but alſo of their rulers, and were honoured and revered by all ranks and orders on account of their extraordinary ſanctity and virtue. Their ſect, however, did not continue always in the ſame high degree of credit and reputation; for though the primitive *Whippers* were exemplary in point of morals, yet their ſocieties were augmented, as might naturally be expected, by a turbulent and furious rabble, many of whom were infected with the moſt ridiculous and impious opinions. Hence both the emperors and pontifs thought proper to put an end to this religious frenzy, by declaring all devout *whipping* contrary to the divine law, and prejudicial to the ſoul's eternal intereſts.

The method of interpreting and explaining the ſcriptures little altered in this century.

IV. The Chriſtian interpreters and commentators of this century, differ very little from thoſe of the preceding times. The greateſt part of them pretended to draw from the depths of truth (or rather of their imaginations) what they called the *Internal juice and marrow* of the ſcriptures, i. e. their hidden and myſterious ſenſe; and this they did with ſo little dexterity, ſo little plauſibility and invention, that the moſt of their explications muſt appear inſipid and nauſeous to ſuch as are not entirely deſtitute of judgment and taſte. If our readers be deſirous of a proof of the juſtice of this cenſure, or curious to try the extent of their patience, they have only to peruſe the explications that have been given by archbiſhop LANGTON, HUGH DE ST. CHER and ANTONY of *Padua*, of the various books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*. The *Myſtic* doctors carried this viſionary method of interpreting ſcripture to the greateſt height, and diſplayed the moſt laborious induſtry, or rather the moſt egregious folly, in ſearching for myſteries, where reaſon and common ſenſe could find nothing but plain and evident truths. They were too *penetrating and quick-ſighted* not to perceive *clearly* in the holy ſcriptures all thoſe doctrines that were agreeable to their idle and fantaſtic ſyſtem. Nor were their adverſaries the *ſchool-men* entirely averſe to this arbitrary and fanciful manner of interpretation; though their principal induſtry was employed rather in collecting the explications given by the ancient doctors, than in inventing new ones, as appears from the writings of ALEXANDER HALES, GUILIELMUS ALVERNUS, and THOMAS AQUINAS himſelf. We muſt not, however, omit obſerving, that the ſcholaſtic doctors in general, and more eſpecially theſe now mentioned, had recourſe often to the ſubtilties of logic and metaphyſic to aſſiſt them in their explications of the ſacred writings. To facilitate the ſtudy and interpretation of theſe divine books, HUGH DE ST. CHER compoſed his *Concordance* [*s*], and the Dominicans, under the eye of their ſupreme chief the learned JORDAN, gave a new edition of the Latin tranſlation of the Bible, carefully reviſed and corrected from the ancient copies [*t*]. The Greeks contributed nothing, that deſerves attention, towards the illuſtration of the Holy Scriptures, the

[*s*] See ECHARDI *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 194.

[*t*] RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſ. par M.* DU PIN.

greateſt part of which were expounded with great learning by GREGORY ABULPHARAIUS, that famous Syrian, whoſe erudition was famous throughout all the eaſt, and whom we have already had occaſion to mention in the courſe of this hiſtory [*u*].

The ſtate of the didactic theology.

V. Syſtems of theology and morals were multiplied exceedingly in this century, and the number of thoſe writers who treated of the divine perfections and worſhip, and of the practical rules of virtue and obedience, is too great to permit our mentioning them particularly. All ſuch as were endowed with any conſiderable degree of genius and eloquence employed their labours upon theſe noble branches of ſacred ſcience, more eſpecially the academical and public teachers, among whom the Dominicans and Franciſcans held the moſt eminent rank. It is, indeed, neither neceſſary to mention the names, nor to enumerate the productions of theſe doctors, ſince whoever is acquainted with the characters and writings of ALBERT the Great, and THOMAS AQUINAS, will know every thing that is worthy of note in the reſt who were no more than their echos. The latter of theſe two truly great men, who was commonly called the *Angel of the ſchools*, or the *Angelic Doctor*, ſat unrivalled at the head of the divines of this century, and deſervedly obtained the principal place among thoſe who digeſted the doctrines of Chriſtianity into a regular ſyſtem, and illuſtrated and explained them in a ſcientific manner. For no ſooner had his ſyſtem or *ſum* of theology and morals ſeen the light, than it was received univerſally with the higheſt applauſe, placed in the ſame rank with the famous *Book of Sentences* of PETER LOMBARD, and admitted as the ſtandard of truth and the great rule according to which the public teachers formed their plans of inſtruction, and the youth their method of ſtudy. Certain writers, indeed, have denied that THOMAS was the author of the celebrated ſyſtem that bears his name [*w*]; but the reaſons they alledge in ſupport of this notion are utterly deſtitute of evidence and ſolidity [*x*].

The ſcholaſtic doctors, for the moſt part, *Realiſts* *.

VI. The greateſt part of theſe doctors followed ARISTOTLE as their model, and made uſe of the logical and metaphyſical principles of that ſubtile philoſopher in illuſtrating the doctrines of Chriſtianity and removing the difficulties with which ſome of them were attended. In their philoſophical explications of the more ſublime truths of that divine religion they followed the hypotheſis of the *Realiſts*, which ſect, in this century, was much more numerous and flouriſhing than that of the *Nominaliſts*, on account of the luſtre and credit it derived from the authority of THOMAS AQUINAS and ALBERT, its learned and venerable patrons. Yet notwithſtanding all the ſubtilty and penetration of theſe *irrefragable*, *ſeraphic*, and *angelic* doctors, as they were commonly ſtyled, they often appeared wiſer in their own conceit, than they were in reality, and frequently did little more than involve in greater obſcurity, the doctrines which they pretended to place in the cleareſt light. For not to mention the ridiculous oddity of many of their expreſſions, the hideous barbarity of their ſtyle, and their extravagant and preſumptuous deſire of prying into matters that infinitely ſurpaſs the comprehenſion of ſhort-ſighted mortals, they were chargeable with defects in their manner of reaſoning, which every true philoſopher will, of all others, be moſt careful to avoid. For they neither defined their terms accurately, and hence aroſe innumerable diſputes merely about words; nor did they divide their ſubject with perſpicuity and preciſion, and hence they generally treated it in a confuſed and unſatisfactory manner. The great *Angelic Doctor* himſelf, notwithſtanding his boaſted method, was defective in theſe reſpects; his definitions are often vague, or obſcure, and his plans or diviſions, though full of art, are frequently deſtitute of clearneſs and proportion.

[*u*] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 277.

[*w*] See JO. LAUNOII *Traditio Eccleſiæ circa Simoniam*, p. 290.

[*x*] See NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xiii. p. 391.—ECHARD and QUETIF, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. Sæc.* xiii. tom. i. p. 293.—ANT. TOURON, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 604.

[* In the original we find *Poſitivi* in the margin, which is manifeſtly a fault; ſince the *Poſitivi* were quite oppoſite, in their method of teaching, to the ſchool-men, and were the ſame with *Biblici* mentioned in the following ſection. See above CENT. XII. P. II. CH. III. § VIII.]

The number of compilers, or *Bibliciſts* *, greatly diminiſhed.

VII. The method of inveſtigating divine truth by reaſon and philoſophy prevailed ſo univerſally and was followed with ſuch ardor, that the number of thoſe, who, in conformity with the example of the ancient doctors, drew their ſyſtems of theology from the holy ſcriptures and the writings of the fathers, and who acquired on that account the name of *Bibliciſts*, diminiſhed from day to day. It is true, indeed, that ſeveral perſons of eminent piety [y], and even ſome of the Roman pontifs [z], exhorted, with great ſeriouſneſs and warmth, the *ſcholaſtic* divines; and more eſpecially thoſe of the univerſity of *Paris*, to change their method of teaching theology, and, laying aſide their philoſophical abſtraction and ſubtilty, to deduce the ſublime ſcience of ſalvation from the holy ſcriptures with that purity and ſimplicity, with which it was there delivered by the inſpired writers. But theſe admonitions and exhortations were without effect; the evil was become too inveterate to admit of a remedy, and the paſſion for logic and metaphyſic was grown ſo univerſal and ſo violent, that neither remonſtrances nor arguments could check its preſumption, or allay its ardor. In juſtice, however, to the ſcholaſtic doctors it is neceſſary to obſerve, that they did not neglect the dictates of the goſpel, nor the authority of tradition; though what they drew from theſe two ſources proves ſufficiently that they had ſtudied neither with much attention or application of mind [a]. And it is moreover certain, that, in proceſs of time, they committed to others the care of conſulting the ſources now mentioned, and reſerved to themſelves the much reſpected province of philoſophy, and the intricate mazes of dialectical chicane. And, indeed, independent of their philoſophical vanity, we may aſſign another reaſon for this method of proceeding drawn from the nature of their profeſſion, and the circumſtances in which they were placed. For the greateſt part of theſe ſubtile doctors were Dominican or Franciſcan friars; and as the monks of theſe Orders had no poſſeſſions, not even libraries, and led, beſides, wandering and itinerant lives, ſuch of them as were ambitious of literary fame, and of the honours of authorſhip, were, for the moſt part, obliged to draw their materials from their own genius and memory, being deſtitute of all other ſuccours.

---

[y] See DU BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 9. 129. 180.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiqq. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 91, 92. 94.

[z] See the famous epiſtle of GREGORY IX to the profeſſors in the univerſity of *Paris*, publiſhed in DU BOULAY's *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 129. The pontif concludes that remarkable epiſtle with the following words: *Mandamus et ſtricte præcipimus, quatenus ſine fermento mundanæ ſcientiæ, doceatis Theologicam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei Philoſophorum figmentis . . . ſed contenti terminis a patribus inſtitutis mentes auditorum veſtrorum fructu cœleſtis eloquii ſaginetis ut hauriant a fontibus ſalvatoris.*

[a] FAYDIT *Alteration du Dogme Theologique par la Philoſophie d'Ariſtote*, p. 289.—RICHARD SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſ. per M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 170. 187.

[* In the margin of the original, inſtead of *Bibliciſts* which we find in the text, Dr. MOSHEIM has wrote *Sententiarii*, which is undoubtedly an overſight. The *Sententiarii*, or followers of PETER LOMBARD, who is conſidered as the father of the ſcholaſtic philoſophy, are to be placed in the ſame claſs with the philoſophical divines, mentioned in the preceding ſection, and were quite oppoſite to the *Biblici*, both in their manner of thinking and teaching. See above CENT. XII. P. II. CH. III. § VIII.]

Much oppoſition made to the ſcholaſtic doctors.

VIII. The opinions which theſe philoſophical divines inſtilled into the minds of the youth appeared to the votaries of the ancient fathers highly dangerous, and even pernicious, and hence they uſed their utmoſt efforts to ſtop the progreſs of theſe opinions and to diminiſh the credit and influence of their authors. Nor was their oppoſition at all ill grounded; for the ſubtile doctors of the ſchool not only explained the myſteries of religion in a manner conformable to the principles of their preſumptuous logic, and modified them according to the imperious dictates of their imperfect reaſon, but alſo propagated the moſt impious ſentiments and tenets concerning the ſupreme Being, the material world, the origin of the univerſe, and the nature of the ſoul. And when it was objected to theſe ſentiments and tenets, that they were in direct contradiction to the genius of Chriſtianity, and to the expreſs doctrines of ſcripture, theſe ſcholaſtic quibblers had recourſe, for a reply, or rather for a method of eſcape, to that perfidious diſtinction, which has been frequently employed by modern deiſts, that theſe tenets were *philoſophically true*, and conformable to right reaſon, but that they were, indeed, *theologically falſe*, and contrary to the orthodox faith. This kindled an open war between the *Bibliciſts*, or Bible-divines, and the ſcholaſtic doctors, which was carried on with great warmth throughout the whole courſe of this century; particularly in the univerſities of *Oxford* and *Paris*, where we find the former loading the latter with the heavieſt reproaches in their public acts, and in their Polemic writings, and accuſing them of corrupting the doctrines of the goſpel, both in their public leſſons, and in their private diſcourſe [b]. Even St. Thomas himſelf was accuſed of holding opinions contrary to the truth; his orthodoxy, at leaſt, was looked upon as extremely dubious by many of the Pariſian doctors [c]. He accordingly ſaw a formidable ſcene of oppoſition ariſing againſt him, but had the good fortune to conjure the ſtorm, and to eſcape untouched. Others, whoſe authority was leſs extenſive and their names leſs reſpectable, were treated with more ſeverity. The living were obliged to confeſs publicly their errors, and the dead, who had perſevered in them to the laſt, had their memories branded with infamy.

---

[b] See Matth. Paris, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 541.—Boulay, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 397. 430. 433. 472, &c.

[c] See Jo. Launoii *Hiſtor. Gymnaſ. Navarræi*, part. III. lib. iii. cap. cxvi. tom. iv. Opp. part. I. p. 485.—Boulay, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 204.—Petri Zornii *Opuſcula Sacra*, tom. i. p. 445.—R. Simon, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. ii. p. 266.—Echardi *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 435.

The Myſtics oppoſe the ſchool-men.

IX. But the moſt formidable adverſaries the ſcholaſtic doctors had to encounter were the *Myſtics*, who, rejecting every thing that had the leaſt reſemblance of argumentation or diſpute about matters of doctrine and opinion, confined their endeavours to the advancement of inward piety, and the propagation of devout and tender feelings, and thus acquired the higheſt degree of popularity. The people, who are much more affected with what touches their paſſions, than with what is only addreſſed to their reaſon, were attached to the *Myſtics* in the warmeſt manner; and this gave ſuch weight to the reproaches and invectives which they threw out againſt the *ſchool-men*, that the latter thought it more prudent to diſarm theſe favourites of the multitude by mild and ſubmiſſive meaſures, than to return their reproaches with indignation and bitterneſs. They accordingly ſet themſelves to flatter the *Myſtics*, and not only extolled their *ſentimental* ſyſtem, but employed their pens in illuſtrating and defending it; nay, they aſſociated it with the ſcholaſtic philoſophy, though they were as different from each other as any two things could poſſibly be. It is well known that BONAVENTURA, ALBERT the great, ROBERT CAPITO, and THOMAS AQUINAS contributed to this reconciliation between Myſticiſm and Dialectics by their learned labours, and even went ſo far as to write commentaries upon DIONYSIUS, the chief of the Myſtics, whom theſe ſubtile doctors probably looked upon with a ſecret contempt.

The ſtate of Chriſtian morality.

X. Both the ſchool-men and Myſtics of this century treated, in their writings, of the obligations of morality, the duties of the Chriſtian life, and of the means that were moſt adapted to preſerve or deliver the ſoul from the ſervitude and contagion of vice; but their methods of handling theſe important ſubjects, were, as may be eaſily conceived, entirely different. We may form an idea of myſtical morality from the *Obſervations of* GEORGE PACHYMERIS *upon the writings of Dionyſius*, and from the *Spiritual Inſtitutes* or *Abridgment of Myſtic Theology*, compoſed by HUMBERT DE ROMANIS, of which productions the firſt was written in Greek, and the ſecond in Latin. As to the ſcholaſtic moraliſts, they were principally employed in defining the nature of virtue and vice in general, and the characters of the various virtues and vices in particular; and hence the prodigious number of *ſums* or ſyſtematical collections, *of virtues and vices*, that appeared in this century. The ſchool-men divided the virtues into two claſſes. The firſt comprehended the *moral* virtues, which differ, in no reſpect from thoſe which ARISTOTLE recommended to his diſciples. The ſecond contained the theological virtues, which, in conſequence of what St. PAUL, ſays, 1 *Corinth.* xiii. 13. they made to conſiſt in *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*. In explaining and illuſtrating the nature of the virtues comprehended in theſe two claſſes, they ſeemed rather to have in view the pleaſure of diſputing than the deſign of inſtructing, and they exhauſted all their ſubtilty in reſolving difficulties which were of their own creation.

THOMAS AQUINAS ſhone forth as a ſtar of the firſt magnitude, though, like the others, he was often covered with impenetrable fogs. The ſecond part of his famous *ſum* was wholly employed in laying down the principles of morality, and in deducing and illuſtrating the various duties that reſult from them; and this part of his learned labours has had the honour and misfortune of paſſing through the hands of a truly prodigious number of commentators.

An important remark relating to the manner of treating morals, in this century.

XI. It is abſolutely neceſſary to obſerve here, that the moral writers of this and the following centuries muſt be red with the utmoſt caution; and with a perpetual attention to this circumſtance, that, though they employ the ſame terms that we find in the ſacred writings, yet they uſe them in a quite different ſenſe from that which they bear in theſe divine books. They ſpeak of juſtice, charity, faith, and holineſs; but as theſe virtues are illuſtrated by theſe quibbling ſophiſts, they differ much from the amiable, and ſublime duties, which CHRIST and his diſciples have inculcated under the ſame denominations. A ſingle example will be ſufficient to render this evident beyond contradiction. A *pious* and *holy* man, according to the ſenſe annexed by our Saviour to theſe terms, is one, who conſecrates his affections and actions to the ſervice of the ſupreme Being, and accounts it his higheſt honour and felicity, as well as his indiſpenſable duty to obey his laws. But, in the ſtyle of the moral writers of this age, he was a *pious* and *holy* man, who deprived himſelf of his poſſeſſions to enrich the prieſthood, to build churches, and found monaſteries, and whoſe faith and obedience were ſo implicitly enſlaved to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontifs, that he believed and acted without examination, as theſe lordly directors thought proper to preſcribe. Nor were the ideas which theſe writers entertained concerning *juſtice*, at all conformable to the nature of that virtue, as it is deſcribed in the holy ſcriptures, ſince in their opinion it was lawful to injure, revile, torment, perſecute, and even put to death, a *Heretic*, i. e. any perſon who refuſed to obey blindly the decrees of the pontifs, or to believe all the abſurdities, which they impoſedupon the credulity of the multitude.

The ſtate of polemic or controverſial theology.

XII. The writers of controverſy in this century were more numerous than reſpectable. NICETAS ACOMINATUS, who made a conſiderable figure among the Greeks, attacked all the different ſects in his work entitled, *The Treaſure of the Orthodox Faith*; but he combated after the Grecian manner, and defended the cauſe he undertook to maintain, rather by the decrees of councils, and the deciſions of the fathers, than by the dictates of reaſon and the authority of ſcripture. RAYMOND of PENNAFORT was one of the firſt among the Latins who abandoned the unchriſtian method of converting infidels by the force of arms and the terrors of capital puniſhments, and who undertook to vanquiſh the Jews and Saracens by reaſon and argument [d]. This engaged in the ſame controverſy a conſiderable number of able diſputants, who were acquainted with the Hebrew and Arabic languages, among whom RAYMOND MARTIN, the celebrated author of the *Sword of Faith* [e], is unqueſtionably entitled to the firſt rank. THOMAS AQUINAS, alſo, appeared with dignity among the Chriſtian champions, and his book againſt the Gentiles [f], is far from being contemptible; nor ought we to omit mentioning a learned work of ALAN DE L'ISLE, which was deſigned to refute the objections of both Jews and Pagans [g]. The writers, who handled other more particular branches of theological controverſy, were far inferior to theſe now mentioned in genius and abilities, and their works ſeemed leſs calculated to promote the truth, than to render their adverſaries odious.

---

[d] ECHARD & QUETIF in *Scriptoribus Ordinis Prædicator.* tom. i. § xiii. p. 106.

The controverſy between the Greeks and Latins continued.

XIII. The grand controverſy between the Greek and Latin church was ſtill carried on, and all the efforts that were made, during this century, to bring it to a concluſion, one way or another, proved ineffectual. GREGORY IX employed the miniſtry of the Franciſcan monks to bring about an accommodation with the Greeks, and purſued with zeal this laudable purpoſe from the year 1232 to the end of his pontificate, but without the leaſt appearance of ſucceſs [h]. INNOCENT IV embarked in the ſame undertaking in the year 1247, and ſent JOHN of PARMA, with other Franciſcan friars, to *Nice* for the ſame purpoſe; while the Grecian pontif came in perſon to *Rome*, and was declared legate of the *Apoſtolic ſee* [i]. But theſe previous acts of mutual civility and reſpect, which could not but excite the hopes of ſuch as longed for the concluſion of theſe unhappy diſcords, did not terminate in the reconciliation that was expected. New incidents aroſe to blaſt the influence of theſe ſalutary meaſures, and the flame of diſſenſion recovered new vigour. Under the pontificate of URBAN IV the aſpect of things changed for the better, and the negotiations for peace were renewed with ſuch ſucceſs, as promiſed a ſpeedy concluſion of theſe unhappy diviſions. For MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS had no ſooner driven the Latins out of *Conſtantinople*, than he ſent ambaſſadors to *Rome* to declare his pacific intentions, that thus he might eſtabliſh his diſputed dominion, and gain over the Roman pontif to his ſide [k]. But during the courſe of theſe negotiations, URBAN's death left matters unfiniſhed, and ſuſpended once more the hopes and expectations of the public. Under the pontificate of GREGORY X, propoſals of peace were again made by the ſame emperor, who, after much oppoſition from his own clergy, ſent ambaſſadors to the council that was aſſembled at *Lions* in the year 1274 [l], and there, with the ſolemn conſent of JOHN VECCUS, patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and ſeveral

---

[e] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article MARTINI.—PAULI COLOMESII *Hiſpania Orient.* p. 209.

[f] JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Delect. Argumentorum et Scriptor. pro veritate Relig. Chriſtian.* p. 270.

[g] *Liber contra Judæos et Paganos.*

[h] See WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. ii. p. 279. 296. & ECHARD, *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 103. 911.—Add to theſe MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major*, p. 386.

[i] See BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. vii. p. 370. 388. 393. 397. 497, 498.—WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. & iv. p. 37.

[k] WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 181. 201. 223. 269. 303.

[l] See WADDING. *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. p. 343. 371. tom. v. p. 9. 29. 62.—COLONIA, *Hiſt. Litter. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 284.

Greek biſhops publicly agreed to the terms of accommodation propoſed by the Roman pontif [m]. This reunion, however, was not durable; for the ſituation of affairs in *Greece* and *Italy* being changed ſome years after this convention, and that in ſuch a manner, as to deliver the former from all apprehenſions of a Latin invaſion, ANDRONICUS, the ſon of MICHAEL, aſſembled a council at *Conſtantinople*, in the palace of *Blachernæ*, A. D. 1284, in which, by a ſolemn decree, this ignominious treaty was declared entirely null, and the famous VECCUS, by whoſe perſuaſion and authority it had been concluded, was ſent into exile [n]. This reſolute meaſure, as may well be imagined, rendered the diviſions more violent than they had been before the treaty now mentioned; and it was alſo followed by an open ſchiſm, and by the moſt unhappy diſcords among the Grecian clergy.

The diſputes concerning the preſence of Chriſt's body in the euchariſt continued.

XIV. We paſs over ſeveral controverſies of a more private kind and of inferior moment, which have nothing in their nature or circumſtances that deſerves the attention of the curious; but we muſt not forget to obſerve, that the grand diſpute concerning the euchariſt was ſtill continued in this century, not only in *France*, but in ſeveral other places. For, though INNOCENT III had, in the council held at the Lateran in the year 1215, preſumptuouſly taken upon him to place *Tranſubſtantiation* among the avowed doctrines of the Latin church, yet the authority of this decree was called in queſtion by many, and ſeveral divines had the courage to maintain the probability of the opinions that were oppoſed to that monſtrous doctrine. Thoſe who, adopting the ſentiments of BERENGER, conſidered the bread and wine in no other light, than as ſigns or ſymbols of the body and blood of CHRIST, did not venture either to defend or profeſs this opinion in a public manner. Many, alſo, thought it ſufficient to acknowledge, what was termed, a *real preſence*, though they explained the *manner* of this preſence quite otherwiſe than the doctrine of INNOCENT had defined it [o]. Among theſe JOHN, ſurnamed PUNGENS ASINUS, a ſubtile doctor of the univerſity of *Paris*, acquired an eminent and diſtinguiſhed name, and, without incurring the cenſure of his ſuperiors, ſubſtituted *Conſubſtantiation* in the place of *Tranſubſtantiation* towards the concluſion of this century [p].

[(m) JOSEPH, and not VECCUS, was patriarch of *Conſtantinople* when this treaty was concluded. The former had bound himſelf by a ſolemn oath never to conſent to a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; for which reaſon the emperor, when he ſent his ambaſſadors to *Lions*, propoſed to JOSEPH the following alternative: that, if they ſucceeded in bringing about an accommodation, he ſhould renounce his patriarchal dignity, but, if they failed in their attempt, he was to remain patriarch, adviſing him, at the ſame time, to retire to a convent, until the matter was decided. The ambaſſadors ſucceeded, JOSEPH was depoſed, and VECCUS elected in his place; when, and not before, this latter ratified the treaty in queſtion by his ſolemn conſent to the ignominious article of *ſupremacy* and *pre-eminence*, which it confirmed to the Roman pontif.]

[n] LEO ALLATIUS *de perpetua conſenſione Eccleſ. Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. c. xv, xvi. p. 727. —FRID. SPANHEIM *de perpet. diſſenſione Græcor. et Latin.* tom. ii. Opp. p. 488, &c.

[o] PET. ALLIX, *Præf. ad F. Johannis Determinat. de Sacramento Altaris*, publiſhed at *London* in 8vo in the year 1686.

[p] The book of this celebrated doctor was publiſhed by the learned ALLIX abovementioned. See BALUZII *Vitæ Pontiff. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 576.—DACHERII *Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor.* tom. iii. p. 58.—ECHARDI *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 561.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

Rites multiplied.

I. IT would be endleſs to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worſhip, in order to increaſe its pomp and render it more ſtriking. Theſe additions were owing partly to the public edicts of the Roman pontifs, and partly to the private injunctions of the Sacerdotal and Monaſtic orders, who ſhared the veneration, which was excited in the multitude by the ſplendor and magnificence of this religious ſpectacle. Inſtead of mentioning theſe additions, we ſhall only obſerve in general, that religion was now become a ſort of a raree-ſhow through the *admirable wiſdom* of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impreſſions more deep and laſting, thought proper to exhibit it in a ſtriking manner, to the external ſenſes. For this purpoſe at certain ſtated times, and eſpecially upon the more illuſtrious feſtivals, the miraculous diſpenſations of the divine wiſdom in favour of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Chriſtian hiſtory, were repreſented under certain allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic ſhew [q]. But theſe ſcenic repreſentations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, theſe tragi-comical ſpectacles, though they amuſed and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, inſtead of being uſeful to the cauſe of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furniſhed abundant matter of laughter to its enemies.

The rites inſtituted in relation to the euchariſt.

II. It will not appear ſurprizing that the bread, conſecrated in the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, became the object of religious worſhip; for this was the natural conſequence of the monſtrous doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*. But the effects of that impious and ridiculous doctrine did not end here; it produced all that train of ceremonies and inſtitutions that are ſtill uſed in the church of *Rome* in honour of that *deified* bread, as they blaſphemouſly call it. Hence thoſe rich and ſplendid receptacles, that were formed for the reſidence of God under this new ſhape [r], and the lamps and other precious ornaments that were deſigned to beautify this habitation of the Deity. And hence the cuſtom that ſtill prevails, of carrying about this *divine bread* in ſolemn pomp through the public ſtreets, when it is to be adminiſtered to ſick or dying perſons, with many other ceremonies of a like nature which are diſhonourable to religion, and opprobrious to humanity. But that which gave the finiſhing touch to this heap of abſurdities, and diſplayed ſuperſtition in its higheſt extravagance, was the inſtitution of the celebrated annual *Feſtival of the Holy Sacrament*, or, as it is ſometimes called, of the *body of Chriſt* whoſe origin was as follows: A certain devout woman, whoſe name was JULIANA, and who lived at *Liege*, declared that ſhe had received a revelation from heaven intimating to her, that it was the will of God, that a peculiar feſtival ſhould be annually obſerved in honour of the *holy ſacrament*, or rather of the *real preſence* of CHRIST's body in that ſacred inſtitution. Few gave attention or credit to this pretended viſion, whoſe circumſtances were extremely equivocal and abſurd [*s*], and which would have come to nothing, had it not been ſupported by ROBERT, biſhop of *Liege*, who, in the year 1246, publiſhed an order for the celebration of this feſtival throughout the whole province, notwithſtanding the oppoſition which he knew would be made to a propoſal founded only on an idle dream. After the death of JULIANA, one of her friends and companions whoſe name was EVE, took up her cauſe with uncommon zeal, and had credit enough with URBAN IV to engage him to publiſh, in the year 1264, a ſolemn edict, by which the feſtival in queſtion was impoſed upon all the Chriſtian churches without exception. This edict, however, did not produce its full and proper effect, on account of the death of the pontif, which happened ſoon after its publication; ſo that the feſtival under conſideration was not celebrated univerſally throughout the Latin churches before the pontificate of CLEMENT V [*t*], who, in the council, held at *Vienne* in *France*, in the year 1311, confirmed the edict of URBAN, and thus, in ſpite of all oppoſition, eſtabliſhed a feſtival, which contributed more to render the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation agreeable to the people, than the decree of the council of the Lateran under INNOCENT III, or than all the exhortations of his lordly ſucceſſors.

---

[q] It is probable enough that this licentious cuſtom of exhibiting mimic repreſentations of religious objects derived its origin from the Mendicant friars.

[(r) This blaſphemous language, which Dr. MOSHEIM is obliged to uſe in repreſenting the abſurdities of the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, is nothing in compariſon with the impious figures that were made uſe of by the abettors of that monſtrous tenet to accommodate it, in ſome meaſure, to the capacities of the multitude. We need not wonder that the Pagans metamorphoſed their JUPITER into a *bull*, a *ſwan*, and other ſuch figures, when we ſee the rulers of the Chriſtian church transforming the Son of God into a piece of bread; a transformation ſo vile, and, even were it not vile, ſo uſeleſs, that it is inconceivable how it could enter into the head of any mortal, and equally ſo, how the biſhops of *Rome* could confide ſo far in the credulity of the people as to riſk their authority by propagating ſuch a doctrine.]

The year of jubilee added to the rites of the church.

III. About the concluſion of this century BONIFACE VIII, added to the public rites and ceremonies of the church, the famous jubilee, which is ſtill celebrated at *Rome* at a ſtated period with the utmoſt profuſion of pomp and magnificence. In the year 1299, a rumour was ſpread abroad among the inhabitants of that city, that all ſuch, as viſited, within the limits of the following year, the church of *St. Peter*, ſhould obtain the remiſſion of all their ſins, and, that this privilege was to be annexed to the performance of the ſame ſervice, once every hundred years. BONIFACE no ſooner heard

---

[(*s*) This fanatical woman declared, that as often as ſhe addreſſed herſelf to God, or to the ſaints in prayer, ſhe ſaw the full moon with a ſmall defect or breach in it; and that, having long ſtudied to find out the ſignification of this ſtrange appearance, ſhe was *inwardly* informed by the ſpirit, that the *moon* ſignified the *church*, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual feſtival in honour of the holy ſacrament.]

[*t*] See BARTHOL. FISEN, *Origo prima Feſti Corporis* CHRISTI *ex Viſo Sanctæ Virgini Julianæ oblato*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Liege*, in the year 1619.—DALLÆUS, *De cultûs religioſi objecto*, p. 287.—*Acta Sanctor. April* tom. i. p. 437. 903.—And above all BENEDICT. *Pont. Max. de Feſtis* CHRISTI *et* MARIÆ, lib. i. c. xiii. p. 360. tom. x. Opp.

of this, than he ordered ſtrict inquiry to be made concerning the author and the foundation of this report, and the reſult of this inquiry was anſwerable to his views; for he was aſſured, by many teſtimonies worthy of credit [*u*] (ſay the Roman catholic hiſtorians) that, from the remoteſt antiquity, this important privilege of remiſſion and indulgence was to be obtained by the ſervices abovementioned. No ſooner had the pontif received this information than he iſſued out an epiſtolary mandate, addreſſed to all Chriſtians, in which he enacted it as a ſolemne lw of the church, that thoſe, who every hundredth or jubilee year, confeſſed their ſins, and viſited, with ſentiments of contrition and repentance, the churches of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* at *Rome*, ſhould obtain thereby the entire remiſſion of their various offences [*w*]. The ſucceſſors of BONIFACE were not ſatiſfied with adding a multitude of new rites and inventions, by way of ornaments, to this ſuperſtitious inſtitution; but, finding by experience that it added to the luſtre and augmented the revenues of the Roman church, they rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five and twentieth year [*x*].

[(*u*) Theſe *Teſtimonies worthy of credit* have never been produced by the Romiſh writers, unleſs we rank in that claſs, that of an old man who had completed his 107th year, and who, being brought before BONIFACE VIII, declared (if we may believe the Abbé FLEURY) that his father, who was a common labourer, had aſſiſted at the celebration of a jubilee an hundred years before that time. See FLEURY *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* towards the end of the xiith century.—It is, however, a very unaccountable thing, if the inſtitution of the jubilee year was not the invention of BONIFACE, that there ſhould be neither in the acts of councils, nor in the records of hiſtory, nor in the writings of the lerned, any trace, or the leaſt mention of its celebration before the year 1300; this, with other reaſons of an irreſiſtible evidence, have perſuaded ſome Roman catholic writers to conſider the inſtitution of the jubilee year, as the invention of this pontif, who, to render it more reſpectable, pretended that it was of a much earlier date. See GHILIN. & VICTORELL apud BONANNI *Numiſm. Pontif. Rom.* tom. i. p. 22, 23.]

[*w*] So the matter is related by JAMES CAJETAN, cardinal of *St. George*, and nephew to BONIFACE, in his *Relatio de Centeſimo ſeu Jubilæo anno*, which is publiſhed in his *Magna Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum*, tom. vi. p. 426. 440. and in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, tom. xxv. p. 267. nor is there any reaſon to believe that his account is erroneous and falſe, nor that BONIFACE acted the part of an impoſtor, from a principle of avarice, upon this occaſion.

[N. B. It is not without aſtoniſhment that we hear Dr. MOSHEIM deciding in this manner with reſpect to the *good faith* of BONIFACE, and the *relation* of his nephew. The character of that wicked perfidious and ambitious pontif is well known, and the *relation* of the cardinal of *St. George*, has been proved to be the moſt ridiculous, fabulous, motley piece of ſtuff that ever uſurped the title of an hiſtorical record. See the excellent *Lettres de M. Chais ſur les Jubilés* (that are mentioned more at large in the following note) tom. i. p. 53.]

[*x*] The various writers, who have treated of the inſtitution of the Roman jubilee, are enumerated by JO. ALBERT FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* p. 316. Among the authors that may be added to this liſt, there is one whom we think it neceſſary to mention particularly, *viz.* the Reverend CHARLES CHAIS, whoſe *Lettres Hiſtoriques et Dogmatiques ſur les Jubilés et des Indulgences*, were publiſhed at the *Hague* in three volumes 8vo. in the year 1751.

[Theſe letters of Mr. CHAIS (miniſter of the French church at the *Hague*, and well known in the Republic of Letters) contain the moſt full and accurate account that has been ever given of the inſtitution of the jubilee, and of the riſe, progreſs, abuſes, and enormities of the infamous traffic of indulgences. This account is judiciouſly collected from the beſt authors of antiquity, and from ſeveral curious records that have eſcaped the reſearches of other writers; it is alſo interſperſed with curious, and ſometimes ludicrous anecdotes that render the work equally productive of entertainment and inſtruction. In the firſt volume of theſe Letters the learned author lays open the nature and origin of the inſtitution of the jubilee; he proves it to have been a human invention, which

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Neſtorians and Jacobites.

I. WE have no account of any new ſects that aroſe among the Greeks during this century. Thoſe of the Neſtorians and Jacobites, which were ſettled in the remoter regions of the eaſt, and who equalled the Greeks in their averſion to the rites and juriſdiction of the Latin church, were frequently ſollicited, by the miniſtry of Franciſcan and Dominican miſſionaries ſent among them by the popes, to receive the Roman yoke. In the year 1246, INNOCENT IV uſed his utmoſt efforts to bring both theſe ſects under his dominion; and in the year 1278, terms of accommodation were propoſed by NICHOLAS IV to the Neſtorians, and particularly to that branch of the ſect which reſided in the Northern parts of *Aſia* [y]. The leading men both among the Neſtorians and Jacobites ſeemed to give ear to the propoſals that were made to them, and were by no means averſe to a reconciliation with the church of *Rome*; but the proſpect of peace ſoon vanquiſhed, and a variety of cauſes concurred to prolong the rupture.

The conteſts of the Roman pontifs with various ſects, whom they branded indiſcriminately with the name of Heretics.

II. During the whole courſe of this century the Roman pontifs carried on the moſt barbarous and inhuman perſecution againſt, what they looked upon as *heretics*, i. e. againſt all thoſe who called their pretended authority and juriſdiction in queſtion, or taught doctrines different from thoſe which were adopted and propagated by the church of *Rome*. For the ſects of the *Cathariſts*, *Waldenſes*, *Petrobruſſians*, &c. gathered ſtrength from day to day, ſpred imperceptibly throughout all *Europe*, aſſembled numerous congregations in *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, and *Germany*, and formed by degrees ſuch a powerful party as rendered them formidable to the Roman pontifs, and

---

owed its *riſe* to the avarice and ambition of the popes, and its credit to the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the people, and whoſe celebration was abſolutely unknown before the thirteenth century, which is the true date of its origin. He takes notice of the various changes it underwent with reſpect to the time of its celebration, the various colours with which the ambitious pontifs covered *it* in order to render *it* reſpectable and alluring in the eyes of the multitude, and expoſes theſe illuſions by many convincing arguments, whoſe gravity is ſeaſoned with an agreeable and temperate mixture of decent raillery. He proves, with the utmoſt evidence, that the papal jubilee is an imitation of the *Secular Games* that were celebrated with ſuch pomp in Pagan *Rome*. He points out the groſs contradictions that reign in the *bulls* of the different popes with reſpect to the nature of this inſtitution and the time of its celebration. Nor does he paſs over in ſilence the infamous traffic of indulgences, the worldly pomp and ſplendor, the crimes, debaucheries, and diſorders of every kind that were obſervable at the return of each jubilee year. He lays alſo before the reader an hiſtorical view of all the jubilees that were celebrated from the pontificate of BONIFACE VIII, in the year 1300, to that of BENEDICT XIV, in 1750, with an entertaining account of the moſt remarkable adventures that happened among the pilgrims who repaired to *Rome* on theſe occaſions. The ſecond and third volumes of theſe intereſting Letters treat of the *indulgences* that are adminiſtered in the church of *Rome*. In which their nature and origin are explained, the doctrine of the Roman catholic divines relating to them ſtated and refuted, the hiſtory of this impious traffic accurately laid down, and its enormities and pernicious effects circumſtantially expoſed with learning, perſpicuity, and candour.]

[y] ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Annal. Eccleſ.* tom. xiii. *ad A.* 1247. § 32. & tom. xv. *ad A.* 1303. § 22. & *ad A.* 1304. § 23.—MATTH. PARIS, *Hiſtor. Major.* p. 372.

menaced the papal juriſdiction with a fatal revolution. To the ancient ſects new factions were added, which, though they differed from each other in various reſpects, yet were all unanimouſly agreed in this one point, *viz.* "That the public, and eſtabliſhed religion was a motley ſyſtem of errors "and ſuperſtition, and that the dominion which the popes had uſurped over "Chriſtians, as alſo the authority they exerciſed in religious matters, were "unlawful and tyrannical." Such were the notions propagated by the ſectaries, who refuted the ſuperſtitions and impoſtures of the times by arguments drawn from the holy ſcriptures, and whoſe declamations againſt the power, the opulence, and the vices of the pontifs and clergy were extremely agreeable to many princes and civil magiſtrates, who groaned under the uſurpations of the ſacred order. The pontifs therefore conſidered themſelves as obliged to have recourſe to new and extraordinary methods of defeating and ſubduing enemies, who both by their number and their rank were every way proper to fill them with terror.

The riſe of the inquiſition in *Narbonne Gaul.*

III. The number of theſe diſſenters from the church of *Rome* was no where greater than in *Narbonne Gaul*[z], and the countries adjacent, where they were received and protected, in a ſingular manner, by RAYMOND VI, earl of *Thoulouſe*, and other perſons of the higheſt diſtinction; and where the biſhops, either through humanity or indolence, were ſo negligent and remiſs in the proſecution of heretics, that the latter, laying aſide all their fears, formed ſettlements, and multiplied prodigiouſly from day to day. INNOCENT III was ſoon informed of all theſe proceedings; and about the commencement of this century ſent legates extraordinary into the ſouthern provinces of *France* to do what the biſhops had left undone, and to extirpate hereſy, in all its various forms and modifications, without being at all ſcrupulous in uſing ſuch methods as might be neceſſary to effect this ſalutary purpoſe. The perſons charged with this ghoſtly commiſſion were RAINIER [a], a Ciſtertian monk, PIERRE DE CASTELNAU[b], arch-deacon of *Maguelonne*, who became alſo afterwards a Ciſtertian friar. Theſe eminent miſſionaries were followed by ſeveral others, among whom was the famous Spaniard DOMINIC, founder of the order of preachers, who, returning from *Rome* in the year 1206, fell in with theſe delegates, embarked in their cauſe, and laboured both by his exhortations and actions in the extirpation of hereſy. Theſe ſpiritual champions, who engaged in this expedition upon the ſole authority of the pope, without either aſking the advice or demanding the ſuccours of the biſhops, and who inflicted capital puniſhment upon ſuch of the heretics as they could not convert by reaſon and argument, were diſtinguiſhed in common diſcourſe by the title of

---

[z] That part of *France* which, in ancient times, comprehended the provinces of *Savoy*, *Dauphiné*, *Provence*, and *Languedoc*.

[(a) Inſtead of RAINIE, other hiſtorians mention one RAOUL, or RALPH, as the aſſociate of PIERRE DE CASTELNAU. See FLEURY, *Hiſtoire Eccleſ.* livr. lxxvi. § 12.]

[b] The greateſt part of the Roman writers conſider PIERRE DE CASTELNAU as the firſt *Inquiſitor*. It will appear hereafter in what ſenſe this aſſertion may be admitted. For an account of this legate, ſee the *Acta Sanctor*. tom. i. Martii, p. 411.

Inquiſitors, and from them the formidable and odious tribunal called the *Inquiſition*, derived its original.

The form of the inquiſition ſettled.

IV. When this new ſet of hereſy-hunters [c] had executed their commiſſion, and purged the provinces to which they were ſent of the greateſt part of the enemies of the Roman faith, the pontifs were ſo ſenſible of their excellent ſervices, that they eſtabliſhed miſſionaries of a like nature, or, in other words, placed *Inquiſitors*, in almoſt every city whoſe inhabitants had the misfortune to be ſuſpected of hereſy, notwithſtanding the reluctance which the people ſhewed to this new inſtitution, and the violence with which they frequently expelled, and ſometimes maſſacred theſe bloody officers of the popiſh hierarchy. The council held at *Thoulouſe*, in the year 1229, by **Romanus**, cardinal of *St. Angelo*, and pope's legate, went ſtill farther, and erected in every city a *council of inquiſitors conſiſting of one prieſt and three laymen* [d]. This inſtitution was, however, ſuperſeded, in the year 1233, by **Gregory** IX, who entruſted the Dominicans, or preaching friars, with the important commiſſion of diſcovering and bringing to judgment the heretics that were lurking in *France*, and in a formal epiſtle diſcharged the biſhops from the burthen of that painful office [e]. Immediately after this, the biſhop of *Tournay*, who was the pope's legate in *France*, began to execute this new reſolution by appointing **Pierre Cellan**, and **Guillaume Arnaud**, *inquiſitors of heretical pravity at Thoulouſe*, and afterwards proceeded in every city, where the Dominicans had a convent, to conſtitute officers of the ſame nature, choſen from among the monks of that celebrated order [ſ]. From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the *inquiſition*, which in this and the following ages ſubdued ſuch a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the reſt committed to the flames without mercy. For the Dominicans erected, firſt at *Tholouſe*, and afterwards at *Carcaſſone* and other places, a tremendous court, before which were ſummoned not only *heretics*, and perſons *ſuſpected of hereſy*, but likewiſe all who were accuſed of *magic*, *ſorcery*, *judaiſm*, *witchcraft*, and other crimes of that kind. This tribunal, in proceſs of time, was erected in the other countries of *Europe*, though not every where with the ſame ſucceſs [g].

[(c) The term of Hereſy-hunters, for which the tranſlator is reſponſible, will not ſeem abſurd, when it is known, that the miſſionaries, who were ſent into the provinces of *France* to extirpate hereſy, and the inquiſitors who ſucceeded them were bound by an oath, not only to ſeek for the heretics in towns, houſes, cellars, and other lurking places, but alſo in woods, caves, fields, *&c.*]

[d] See **Harduini** *Concilia*, tom. vii. p. 175.

[e] **Bernhard. Guidonis** *in Chronico Pontif. MS. ap.* **Jac. Echardum** *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 88.—**Percini** *Hiſtoria Inquiſit. Toloſanæ*, ſubjoined to his *Hiſtoria Conventus FF Prædicat. Toloſæ*, 1693, in 8vo.—*Hiſtoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 394, 395.

[ſ] **Echard** & **Percinus** *loc. citat.*

[g] The accounts we have here given of the firſt riſe of the *Inquiſition*, though founded upon the moſt unexceptionable teſtimonies and the moſt authentic records, are yet very different from thoſe that are to be found in moſt authors. Certain learned men tell us, that the *Tribunal of the Inquiſition* was the invention of St. **Dominic**, and was firſt erected by him in the city of *Tholouſe*: that he, of conſequence, was the firſt inquiſitor: that the year of its inſtitution is indeed uncertain; but that it was, undoubtedly, confirmed in a ſolemn manner, by **Innocent** III, in the council of the Lateran

V. The method of proceeding in this court of inquiſition was at firſt ſimple, and almoſt in every reſpect, ſimilar to that, which was obſerved in the ordinary courts of juſtice [b]. But this ſimplicity was gradually changed by the Dominicans, to whom experience ſuggeſted ſeveral new methods of augmenting the pomp and majeſty of their ſpiritual tribunal, and who made ſuch alterations in the forms of proceeding, that the manner of taking cognizance of *heretical* cauſes became totally different from that which was uſual in civil affairs. Theſe friars were, to ſay the truth, entirely ignorant of judicial matters; nor were they acquainted with the procedures of any other tribunal, than that which was called, in the Roman church, the *Tribunal of penance*. It was therefore after this, that they modelled the new court of *Inquiſition*, as far as a reſemblance between the two was poſſible; and hence aroſe that ſtrange ſyſtem of *inquiſitorial* law, which, in many reſpects, is ſo contrary to the common feelings of humanity, and the plaineſt dictates of equity and juſtice. This is the important circumſtance by which we are enabled to account for the abſurd, imprudent, and iniquitous proceedings of the inquiſitors againſt perſons, that are accuſed of holding, what they call, heretical opinions.

The rights and privileges granted to the inquiſition.

VI. That nothing might be wanting to render this ſpiritual court formidable and tremendous, the Roman pontifs perſuaded the European princes, and more eſpecially the emperor FREDERIC II and LEWIS IX king of *France*,

---

in the year 1215. See JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriente*, p. 569.—PHIL. LIMBORCHI *Hiſtoria Inquiſit*. lib. i. c. x. p. 39. and the other writers mentioned by FABRICIUS. I will not affirm, that the writers, who give this account of the matter, have advanced all this without authority; but this I will venture to ſay, that the authors, whom they have taken for their guides, are not of the firſt rate in point of merit and credibility. LIMBORCH, whoſe *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, is looked upon as a moſt important and capital work, is generally followed by modern writers in their accounts of that odious tribunal. But, however laudable that hiſtorian may have been in point of fidelity and diligence, it is certain that he was but little acquainted with the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of the middle age; that he drew his materials, not from the true and original ſources, but from writers of a ſecond claſs, and thus has fallen, in the courſe of his hiſtory, into various miſtakes. His account of the origin of the inquiſition is undoubtedly falſe; nor does that which is given by many other writers approach nearer to the truth. The circumſtances of this account, which I have mentioned in the beginning of this note, are more eſpecially deſtitute of the ſmalleſt foundation. Many of the Dominicans, who, in our times, have preſided in the court of inquiſition, and have extolled the ſanctity of that *pious* inſtitution, deny, at the ſame time, that DOMINIC was its founder, as alſo that he was the firſt inquiſitor, nay, that he was an inquiſitor at all. They go ſtill farther, and affirm, that the court of inquiſition was not erected during the life of St. DOMINIC. Nor is all this advanced inconſiderately, as every impartial inquirer into the proofs they alledge will eaſily perceive. Neverthеleſs, the queſtion, Whether or not St. DOMINIC was an inquiſitor, ſeems to be merely a diſpute about words, and depends entirely upon the different ſignifications of which the term *inquiſior* is ſuſceptible. That word, according to its original meaning, ſignified a perſon inveſted with the commiſſion and authority of the Roman pontif to extirpate hereſy, and oppoſe its abettors, but not cloathed with any judicial power. But it ſoon acquired a different meaning, and ſignified a perſon appointed by the Roman pontif to proceed *judicially* againſt heretics and ſuch as were ſuſpected of hereſy, to pronounce ſentence according to their reſpective caſes, and to deliver over to the ſecular arm ſuch as perſiſted obſtinately in their errors. In this latter ſenſe DOMINIC was not an *inquiſitor*; ſince it is well known that there were no papal judges of this nature before the pontificate of GREGORY IX; but he was undoubtedly an *inquiſitor* in the original ſenſe that was attached to that term.

[b] The records, publiſhed by the Benedictines in their *Hiſtoire Gener. de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 371. ſhew the ſimplicity that reigned in the proceedings of the inquiſition at its firſt inſtitution.

not only to enact the moſt barbarous laws againſt *heretics*, and to commit to the flames, by the miniſtry of public juſtice, thoſe who were pronounced *ſuch* by the *inquiſitors*, but alſo to maintain the inquiſitors in their office, and grant them their protection in the moſt open and ſolemn manner. The edicts to this purpoſe iſſued out by FREDERIC II are well known; edicts every way proper to excite horror, and which rendered the moſt illuſtrious piety and virtue incapable of ſaving from the cruelleſt death ſuch as had the misfortune to be diſagreeable to the *inquiſitors* [*i*]. Theſe abominable laws were not, however, ſufficient to reſtrain the juſt indignation of the people againſt theſe inhuman judges, whoſe barbarity was accompanied with ſuperſtition and arrogance, with a ſpirit of ſuſpicion and perfidy, nay, even with temerity and imprudence. Accordingly they were inſulted by the multitude in many places, were driven, in an ignominious manner, out of ſome cities, and were put to death in others; and CONRAD of *Marpurg*, the firſt German inquiſitor, who derived his commiſſion from GREGORY IX, was one of the many victims that were ſacrificed upon this occaſion to the vengeance of the public [*k*], which his incredible barbarities had raiſed to a dreadful degree of vehemence and fury [*l*].

Severer methods are employed againſt the heretics.

VII. When INNOCENT III perceived that the labours of the firſt *inquiſitors* were not immediately attended with ſuch abundant fruits as he had fondly expected, he addreſſed himſelf, in the year 1207, to PHILIP AUGUSTUS, king of *France*, and to the leading men of that nation, ſolliciting them by the alluring promiſe of the moſt ample *indulgences*, to extirpate all, whom he thought proper to call, heretics, by fire and ſword [*m*]. This exhortation was repeated with new acceſſions of fervor and earneſtneſs the year following, when PIERRE DE CASTELNAU, the legate of this pontif, and his inquiſitor in *France*, was put to death by the patrons of the people, called heretics [*n*]. Not long after this, the Ciſtertian monks, in the name of this pope, proclaimed a cruſade againſt the heretics throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and a ſtorm ſeemed to be gathering againſt them on all ſides: RAYMOND VI, earl of *Tholouſe*, in whoſe territories CASTELNAU had been maſſacred, was ſolemnly excommunicated; and, to deliver himſelf from this eccleſiaſtical malediction, changed ſides, and embarked in the cruſade now mentioned. In the year 1209, a formidable army of croſs-bearers commenced againſt the heretics, who were comprehended under the general denomination of *Albigenſes* [o], an open war which they carried on with the utmoſt exertions of cruelty, though with various ſucceſs, for ſeveral years. The chief director of this ghoſtly war was ARNALD, abbot of the Ciſtertians, and legate of the Roman pontif: and the commander in chief of the troops employed in this *noble* expedition was SIMON earl of *Montfort*. RAYMOND VI, earl of *Tholouſe*, who, conſulting his ſafety rather than his conſcience, had engaged in the cruſade againſt the heretics, was obliged to change ſides, and to attack their perſecutors. For SIMON, who had embarked in this war not ſo much from a principle of zeal for religion, or of averſion to the heretics, as from a deſire of augmenting his fortune, caſt a greedy eye upon the territories of RAYMOND, and his ſelfiſh views were ſeconded and accompliſhed by the court of *Rome*. After many battles, ſieges, and a multitude of other exploits conducted with the moſt intrepid courage and the moſt abominable barbarity, he received from the hands of INNOCENT III, at the council of the Lateran, A. D. 1215, the county of *Tholouſe*, and the other lands belonging to that earl, as a reward for his zeal in ſupporting the *cauſe of God* and of *the church*. About three years after this, he loſt his life at the ſiege of *Tholouſe*, and was followed by RAYMOND, his valiant adverſary, in the year 1222.

[*i*] The law of the emperor FREDERIC, in relation to the inquiſitors, may be ſeen in LIMBORCH'S *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, as alſo in the *Epiſtles* of PIERRE DE VIGNES, and in BZOVIUS RAYNALDUS, &c. The edict of St. LEWIS, in favour of theſe ghoſtly judges, is generally known under the title of *Cupientes*; for ſo it is called by the French lawyers on account of its beginning with that word. It was iſſued out in the year 1229, as the Benedictine monks have proved ſufficiently in their *Hiſt. Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 378. 575. It is alſo publiſhed by CATELIUS, in his *Hiſtor. Comit. Toloſanor.* p. 340. and in many other authors. This edict is as ſevere and inhuman, to the full, as the laws of FREDERIC II. For a great part of the *ſanctity* of good king LEWIS conſiſted in his furious and implacable averſion to *heretics*, againſt whom he judged it more expedient to employ the influence of racks and gibets, than the power of reaſon and argument. See DU FRESNE *Vita Ludovici a Joinvillio ſcripta*, p. 11. 39.

[*k*] The life of this furious and celebrated inquiſitor has been compoſed from the moſt authentic records that are extant, and alſo from ſeveral valuable manuſcripts by the learned JOHN HERMAN SCHMINKIUS. See alſo WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. ii. p. 151. 355. & ECHARD. *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i. p. 487.

[(*l*) The Abbé FLEURY acknowledges the brutal barbarity of this unrelenting inquiſitor, who, under the pretext of hereſy, not only committed to the flames a prodigious number of nobles, clerks, monks, hermits, and lay-perſons of all ranks, but moreover cauſed them to be put to death, the very ſame day they were accuſed, without appeal. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. lxxx. § 24.]

[*m*] INNOCENTII III, *Epiſtolæ*, *Lib.* x. *Epiſt.* 49.

[*n*] Id. ibid. *Lib.* xi. *Ep.* 26, 27, 28, 29.—*Acta Sanctor. Mart.* tom. i. p. 411.

The fruitleſs oppoſition made by the earl of *Tholouſe* to the Roman pontif.

VIII. Thus were the two chiefs of this deplorable war taken off the ſcene; but this removal was far from extinguiſhing the infernal flame of perſecution on the ſide of the pontifs, or calming the reſtleſs ſpirit of faction on that of the pretended heretics. RAYMOND VII, earl of *Tholouſe*, and AMALRIC, earl of *Montfort*, ſucceeded their fathers at the head of the contending parties, and carried on the war with the utmoſt vehemence; and with ſuch various ſucceſs as rendered the iſſue for ſome time doubtful. The former ſeemed at firſt more powerful than his adverſary, and the Roman pontif Honorius III, alarmed at the vigorous oppoſition he made to the orthodox legions, engaged Lewis VIII, king of *France*, by the moſt pompous promiſes, to march in perſon with a formidable army againſt the enemies of the church. The obſequious monarch liſtened to the ſollicitations of the lordly pontif, and embarked with a conſiderable military force in the cauſe of the church, but did not live to reap the fruits of his zeal. His engagements, however, with the court of *Rome*, and his furious deſigns againſt the heretics, were executed with the greateſt alacrity and vigour by his ſon and ſucceſſor Lewis the *Saint*; ſo that Raymond, preſſed on all ſides, was obliged, in the year 1229, to make peace upon the moſt diſadvantageous terms, even by making a ceſſion of the greateſt part of his territories to the *French* monarch, after having ſacrificed a conſiderable portion of them, as a peace-offering to the church of *Rome* [p]. This treaty of peace gave a mortal blow to the cauſe of hereſy, and diſperſed the champions that had appeared in its defence; the *inquiſition* was eſtabliſhed at *Tholouſe*, and the heretics were not only expoſed to the *pious* cruelties of Lewis, but, what was ſtill more ſhocking, Raymond himſelf, who had formerly been their patron, became their perſecutor, and treated them, upon all occaſions, with the moſt inhuman ſeverity. It is true, this prince broke the engagements into which he had entred by the treaty abovementioned, and renewed the war againſt Lewis and the inquiſitors, who abuſed their victory and the power they had acquired in the moſt odious manner. But this new effort, in favour of the heretics, was attended with little or no effect; and the unfortunate earl of *Tholouſe*, the laſt repreſentative of that noble and powerful houſe, dejected and exhauſted by the loſſes he had ſuſtained and the perplexities in which he was involved, died, in the year 1249, without male iſſue. And thus ended a civil war, of which religion had been partly the cauſe, and partly the pretext, and which, in its conſequences, was highly profitable both to the kings of *France* and to the Roman pontifs [q].

---

[o] The term *Albigenſes* is uſed in two ſenſes, of which the one is general, and the other more confined. In its more general and extenſive ſenſe it comprehends all the various kinds of heretics who reſided at this time in *Narbonne-Gaul*, i. e. in the ſouthern parts of *France*. This appears from the following paſſage of PETRUS SARNENSIS, who, in the *Dedication of his Hiſtory of the Albigenſes to Innocent* III, expreſſes himſelf thus: *Toloſani et aliarum civitatum, et caſtrorum hæretici, et defenſores eorum generaliter Albigenſes vocantur.* The ſame author divides afterwards the *Albigenſes* into various ſects (*Cap.* ii. p. 3. & 8.) of which he conſiders that of the *Waldenſes* as the leaſt pernicious. *Mali erant Waldenſes, ſed comparatione aliorum hæreticorum longe minus perverſi.* It was not, however, from the city of *Albigia*, or *Albi*, that the French heretics were comprehended under the general title of *Albigenſes*, but from another circumſtance, to wit, that the greateſt part of *Narbonne-Gaul* was, in this century, called *Albigeſium*, as the Benedictine monks have clearly demonſtrated in their *Hiſtoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. not. xiii. p. 552. The term *Albigenſes*, in its more confined ſenſe, was uſed to denote thoſe heretics who inclined towards the Manichæan ſyſtem, and who were otherwiſe known by the denominations of *Cathariſts*, *Publicans* or *Paulicians*, and *Bulgarians*. This appears evidently from many inconteſtable authorities, and, more eſpecially from the *Codex Inquiſitionis Toloſanæ*, publiſhed by LIMBORCH, in his *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, and in which the *Albigenſes* are carefully diſtinguiſhed from the other ſects that made a noiſe in this century.

[(p) It was in conſequence of this treaty (of which the articles were drawn up at *Meaux*, and afterwards confirmed at *Paris* in preſence of Lewis) that the univerſity of *Tholouſe* was founded, Raymond having bound himſelf thereby to pay the ſum of 4000 ſilver marcs, in order to the ſupport of two profeſſors of divinity, two of canon law, two of grammar, and ſix of the liberal arts, during the ſpace of ten years. We muſt alſo obſerve, that, what Dr. Mosheim ſays of the ceſſion that Raymond made of his lands, is not ſufficiently clear and accurate. Theſe lands were not to be transferred till after his death, and they were to be transferred to the brother of Lewis IX, who, according to the treaty, was to eſpouſe the daughter of Raymond. See Fleury, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. lxxix. § 50.]

[q] Many writers both ancient and modern have related the circumſtances of this religious war, that was carried on againſt the earls of *Tholouſe* and their confederates, and alſo againſt the heretics, whoſe cauſe they maintained. But none of the hiſtorians, whom I have conſulted on this ſubject, have treated it with that impartiality which is ſo eſſential to the merit of hiſtorical writing. The Proteſtant writers, among whom Basnage deſerves an eminent rank, are too favorable to Raymond and the *Albigenſes*; the Roman-catholic hiſtorians lean with ſtill more partiality to the other ſide. Of theſe latter the moſt recent are Benedict, a Dominican monk, author of the *Hiſtoire des Al-*

The Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit.

IX. The ſeverity which the court of *Rome* employed in the extirpation of hereſy, and the formidable arguments of fire and ſword, racks and gibets, with which the popes and their creatures reaſoned againſt the enemies of the church, were not ſufficient to prevent the riſe of new and moſt pernicious ſects in ſeveral places. Many of theſe ſects were inconſiderable in themſelves, and tranſitory in their duration, while ſome of them made a noiſe in the world, and were ſuppreſſed with difficulty. Among the latter we may reckon that of the *Brethren and ſiſters of the free ſpirit*, which about this time gained ground ſecretly and imperceptibly in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, and ſeduced into its boſom multitudes of perſons of both ſexes, by the ſtriking appearance of piety that was obſerved in the conduct of the members that compoſed it. How far the councils of this century proceeded againſt this new ſect, we cannot ſay with any certainty; becauſe we have upon record but a few of the decrees that were iſſued out upon that occaſion. Perhaps the obſcurity of the riſing faction ſkreened it, in a great meaſure, from public view. But this was not the caſe in the following age; the *Brethren* and *Siſters* above-mentioned came forth from their retreats in proportion as their numbers increaſed; they drew upon them the eyes of the world, and particularly thoſe of the *inquiſitors*, who committed to the flames ſuch of theſe unhappy enthuſiaſts as fell into their hands; while the councils, held in *Germany* and other nations, loaded them with excommunications and damnatory edicts.

This new ſect took their denomination from the words of St. PAUL [r], and maintained that the true children of God were inveſted with the privilege of a full and perfect *freedom* from the juriſdiction of the *law* [s]. They were called, by the Germans and Flemiſh, *Beghards* and *Beguttes*, which, as we have ſeen already, was a name uſually given to thoſe who made an extra-

---

lbigeois, des Vaudois et des Barbets, publiſhed at *Paris*, in 1691, in two volumes 12mo.—J. BAPT. LANGLOIS, a jeſuit, who compoſed the *Hiſtoire des Croiſades contre les Albigeois*, which was publiſhed in 12mo at *Rouen*, in 1703, to which we muſt add JO. JAC. PERCINI *Monumenta Conventûs Toloſani Ordinis F F Prædicator. in quibus Hiſtoria hujus Conventus diſtribuitur et refertur totius Albigenſium facti narratio, Toloſæ*, 1693 *Fol.* Theſe writers are chargeable with the greateſt partiality and injuſtice in the reproaches and calumnies they throw out ſo liberally againſt the RAYMONDS and the Albigenſes, while they diſguiſe, with a perfidious dexterity, the barbarity of SIMON of *Montfort*, and the ambitious views of extending their dominions that engaged the kings of *France* to enter into this war. The moſt ample and accurate account of this expedition againſt the Heretics is that which is given by the learned Benedictines CLAUDE LE VIC and JOSEPH VAISSETTE, in their *Hiſtoire Generale de Languedoc*, *Paris* 1730. tom. iii. in which, however, there are ſeveral omiſſions which render that valuable work defective.

[r] *Romans* viii. 2, 14.

[s] The accounts we here give of theſe wretched Fanatics are, for the moſt part, taken from authentic records, which have not been as yet publiſhed, from the decrees of ſynods and councils held in *France* and *Germany*, from the *Diploma's* of the Roman pontifs, the ſentences pronounced by the inquiſitors, and the other ſources of information to which I have had acceſs. I have alſo a collection of extracts from certain books of theſe enthuſiaſts, and more eſpecially from that which treated of the *Nine ſpiritual rocks*, and which was in the higheſt eſteem among the *free brethren*, who conſidered it as a treaſure of divine wiſdom and doctrine. As I cannot expoſe here theſe records to the examination of the curious reader, I beg leave to refer him to a long and ample edict iſſued out againſt theſe *Brethren* by HENRY I, archbiſhop of *Cologn*, and publiſhed in the *Statuta Colonienſia*, A. 1554. p. 58. This edict is, in every reſpect, conformable to thoſe publiſhed, on the ſame occaſion, at *Mertz*, *Aſchaffenburg*, *Paderborn*, *Beziers*, *Triers*, and other places.

ordinary profeſſion of piety and devotion. They received from others the reproachful denomination of *Bicorni*, i. e. Ideots. In *France* they were known by the appellation of *Beghins* and *Beghines*, while the multitude diſtinguiſhed them by that of *Turlupins*, the origin and reaſon of which title I have not been able to learn [t]. Nothing carried a more ſhocking air of lunacy and diſtraction than their external aſpect and manners. They ran from place to place cloathed in the moſt ſingular and fantaſtic apparel, and begged their bread with wild ſhouts and clamours, rejecting with horror every kind of induſtry and labour, as an obſtacle to divine contemplation, and to the aſcent of the ſoul towards the father of ſpirits. In all their excurſions they were followed by women, with whom they lived in the moſt intimate familiarity [u]. They diſtributed among the people books, which contained the ſubſtance of their doctrine, held nocturnal aſſemblies in places remote from public view, and ſeduced many from frequenting the ordinary inſtitutions of divine worſhip.

The myſtical doctrines of this ſect.

X. Theſe *brethren*, who gloried in the *freedom* which they pretended to have obtained, *through the ſpirit*, from the dominion and obligation of the *law*, adopted a certain rigid and fantaſtic ſyſtem of *Myſtic theology*, built upon pretended philoſophical principles, which carried a ſtriking reſemblance of the impious doctrines of the *Pantheiſts*. For they held, "That "things followed *by emanation* from God, and were finally to return to their "divine ſource: that rational ſouls were ſo many *portions* of the ſupreme "Deity, and that the univerſe, conſidered as one great whole, was God: "that every man by the power of contemplation, and by calling off his "mind from ſenſible and terreſtrial objects, might be united to the Deity "in an ineffable manner, and become one with the ſource and parent of "all things: and that they, who, by long and aſſiduous meditation, had "plunged themſelves, as it were, into the *abyſs* of the divinity, acquired "thereby a moſt glorious and ſublime liberty, and were not only delivered "from the violence of ſinful luſts, but even from the common inſtincts of "nature." From theſe and ſuch like doctrines the *brethren*, under conſideration, drew this impious and horrid concluſion, "That the perſon who "had aſcended to God in this manner, and was abſorbed by contemplation "in the abyſs of Deity, became thus a part of godhead, commenced God, "was the *Son of God* in the ſame ſenſe and manner that Christ was, and "was thereby raiſed to a glorious independance, and freed from the obli"gation of all laws human and divine." It was in conſequence of all this, that they treated with contempt the ordinances of the goſpel, and every external act of religious worſhip, looking upon prayer, faſting, baptiſm, and the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, as the firſt elements of piety adapted to the ſtate and capacity of children, and as of no ſort of uſe to the *perfect man*, whom long meditation had raiſed above all external things, and carried into the boſom and eſſence of the Deity [*w*].

---

[t] Many have written, but none with accuracy and preciſion, concerning the *Turlupins*. See Beausobre's *Diſſertation ſur les Adamites*, part. II. p. 384. where that learned author has fallen into ſeveral errors, as uſually happens to him when he treats ſubjects of this kind. I know not the origin of the word *Turlupin*, but I am able to demonſtrate by the moſt authentic records, that the perſons ſo called, who were burnt at *Paris* and in other parts of *France*, were no other than the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, who were condemned by the Roman pontifs, and alſo by various councils.

[u] Hence they were called, in *Germany*, *Schweſtriones*, as appears by the decrees of ſeveral councils.

Among theſe heretics there were ſome that diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their eminent probity, and others that were licentious in an infamous degree.

XI. Among theſe Fanatics there were ſeveral perſons of eminent probity, who had entered into this ſect with the moſt upright intentions, and who extended that *liberty of the ſpirit*, which they looked upon as the privilege of true believers, no farther than to an exemption from the duties of external worſhip, and an immunity from the poſitive laws of the church. The whole of religion was placed by this claſs of men in internal devotion, and they treated with the utmoſt contempt the rules of monaſtic diſcipline, and all other external rites and inſtitutions, as infinitely beneath the attention of the *perfect*. Nor were their exhortations and their examples without effect; for about the middle of this century they perſuaded a conſiderable number of monks and devout perſons, in *Swabia*, *to live without any rule, and to ſerve God in the liberty of the ſpirit, which was the moſt acceptable ſervice that could be preſented to the Deity* [*x*]. The inquiſitors, however, ſtopped theſe poor enthuſiaſts in the midſt of their career, and committed ſeveral of them to the flames, in which they expired, not only with the moſt unclouded ſeverity, but even with the moſt triumphant feelings of chearfulneſs and joy.

[*w*] It may not be improper to place here a certain number of ſentences tranſlated faithfully from ſeveral of the more ſecret books of theſe Heretics. The following will be ſufficient to give the curious reader a full idea of their impiety:

Every pious and good man is the only begotten ſon of God, whom God engendred from all eternity: (for theſe Heretics maintained, that what the ſcriptures taught concerning the diſtinction of *Three Perſons* in the divine nature, is by no means to be underſtood literally, and therefore explained it according to the principles of their myſtical and fantaſtic ſyſtem.)

All created things are non-entities or nothing: I do not ſay that they are ſmall and minute; but that they are abſolutely nothing.

There is in the ſoul of man ſomething that is neither created, nor ſuſceptible of creation, and that is, rationality, or the power of reaſoning.

God is neither good, nor better, nor beſt: whoſoever therefore calls the Deity good, does as fooliſhly as he who calls an object black, which he knows to be white.

God ſtill engenders his only-begotten ſon, and begets ſtill the ſame ſon, whom he had begotten from eternity. For every operation of the Deity is uniform and one; and therefore he engenders his ſon without any diviſion.

What the ſcriptures ſay concerning Chriſt is true of every good, of every divine man. And every quality of the divine nature belongs equally to every perſon, whoſe piety is genuine and ſincere.

To theſe horrid paſſages we may add the following ſentences, in which JOHN, biſhop of *Straſbourg* (in an edict he publiſhed againſt the *Brethren of the free ſpirit or Beghards*, in the year 1317, the Sunday before the feaſt of the aſſumption of the Virgin Mary) diſcovers farther the blaſphemous doctrines of this impious ſect. *Deus* (ſay theſe Heretics) *eſt formaliter omne quod eſt. Quilibet homo perfectus eſt Chriſtus per naturam. Homo perfectus eſt liber in totum, nec tenetur ad ſervandum præcepta eccleſiæ data à Deo. Multa ſunt poetica in evangelio, quæ non ſunt vera, et homines credere magis debent conceptibus ex anima ſua Deo juncta profectis, quam evangelio*, &c.

[*x*] See MART. CRUSIUS *Annal. Suevicorum*, part. III. lib. ii. cap. xiv. *ad A.* 1261. p. 99. edit. *Vet.*—This author has taken his materials from *Felix Faber*, an impartial writer.

But there were among theſe *Brethren of the free ſpirit* another claſs of Fanatics very different from theſe now mentioned, and much more extravagant, whoſe ſyſtem of religion was as dangerous, as it was ridiculous and abſurd, ſince it opened a door to the moſt licentious manners. Theſe wretched enthuſiaſts maintained, that, by continual contemplation, it was poſſible to eradicate all the inſtincts of nature out of the *heaven-born* mind, and to introduce into the ſoul a certain divine ſtupor, and holy apathy, which they looked upon as the great characteriſtics of Chriſtian perfection. The perſons, who adopted theſe ſentiments, took ſtrange liberties in conſequence of their pretended ſanctity, and ſhewed, indeed, by their conduct that they had little regard to external appearances; for they held their ſecret aſſemblies ſtark naked, and lay in the ſame beds with their ſpiritual ſiſters, or, indiſcriminately, with other women, without the ſmalleſt ſcruple or heſitation. This ſhocking violation of decency was a conſequence of their pernicious ſyſtem. They looked upon decency and modeſty as marks of inward corruption, as the characters of a ſoul that was ſtill under the dominion of the ſenſual, animal, and laſcivious ſpirit, and that was not, as yet, re-united to the divine nature, its center and ſource. And they conſidered, as at a fatal diſtance from the Deity, all ſuch as either felt the carnal ſuggeſtions of nature, or were penetrated with warm emotions at the view or approach of perſons of a different ſex, or were incapable of vanquiſhing and ſuppreſſing the riſing fervor of luſt and intemperance [*y*].

There were moreover, in this fanatical troop, certain enthuſiaſts, who far ſurpaſſed in impiety the two claſſes we have been now mentioning, who abuſed the ſyſtem and doctrines of the ſect, ſo as to draw from them an apology for all kinds of wickedneſs, and who audaciouſly maintained that the *divine man*, or the believer, who was intimately united to God, *could not ſin*, let his conduct be ever ſo horrible and atrocious. This execrable doctrine was not, indeed, explained in the ſame manner by all the *Brethren of the free ſpirit* that were ſo outrageous as to adopt it. Some held, that the motions and actions of the body had no relation at all to the ſoul, which, by its union with God, was blended with the divine nature: others fell into a notion infinitely injurious to the ſupreme Being, and maintained, that the propenſities and paſſions, that aroſe in the ſoul of the *divine man* after his union with the Deity, were the propenſities and affections of God himſelf, and were therefore, notwithſtanding their apparent deformity and oppoſition to the law, holy and good, ſeeing that the ſupreme Being is infinitely exalted above all law, and all obligation [z]. It is neceſſary to obſerve, before we leave this ſubject, that flagitious and impious impoſtors mingled themſelves ſometimes with this ſect, and took the name of *Beghards*, that by a feigned piety they might impoſe upon the multitude, and deceive the ſimple into their ſnares [a].

[*y*] Certain writers, whoſe principal zeal is employed in the defence of theſe heretics, and who have accuſtomed themſelves to entertain a high idea of the ſanctity of all thoſe, who, in the middle age ſeparated themſelves from the communion of the church of *Rome*, ſuſpect the inquiſitors of having attributed falſely theſe impious doctrines to the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, with a view to blacken theſe pious men, and to render them odious. But this ſuſpicion is entirely groundleſs; and the account of this matter, which we have given in the text, is conformable to the ſtricteſt truth. The inquiſitors have been leſs fabulous in their accuſations of theſe heretics, than many are apt to imagine. They acknowledge that the *Beghards*, though deſtitute of ſhame, were not chargeable, generally ſpeaking, with a breach of the duties of chaſtity and abſtinence. They were indeed of opinion, that this firmneſs and inſenſibility of heart, which rendered them proof againſt female charms and deaf to the voice of nature, was a privilege granted them by the devil. For they adopted the opinion of honeſt Nieder, (*Formicar.* lib. iii. cap. v. p. 346.) and affirmed, that it was in the power of that evil ſpirit to *render men cold*, and to extinguiſh the warm and laſcivious ſollicitations of nature; and that Satan wrought this miracle upon his friends and adherents in order to procure them a high reputation of ſanctity, and make them appear ſuperior in virtue to the reſt of mankind. *Credo* (ſaith Nieder, who was both a Dominican and an inquiſitor) *quoſdam ex eis dæmonis opere affectos fuiſſe, ne moverentur ad naturales actus incontinentiæ . . . . Facillimum enim eſt dæmonibus infrigidare.*

---

[z] This acccount will be confirmed by the following paſſage faithfully tranſlated from the famous book of the *Nine Rocks*, written originally in German: *Moreover the divine man operates and engenders whatever the Deity operates and engenders. For in God he produced and formed the heavens and the earth. He is alſo the father of the eternal word. Neither could God produce any thing without this divine man, who is therefore obliged to render his will conformable to the will of God, that ſo whatſoever may be agreeable to the Deity, may be agreeable to him alſo. If therefore it be the will of God that I ſhould commit ſin, my will muſt be the ſame, and I muſt not even deſire to abſtain from ſin. This is true contrition. And although a man, who is well and truly united to God, may have committed a thouſand mortal ſins, he ought not even to wiſh that he had not committed them; nay, he ſhould rather die a thouſand deaths than omit one of theſe mortal ſins.* Hence the accuſation brought by the inquiſitors againſt this impious ſect, whom they reproach with maintaining, that the *ſin of a man united to God, is not ſin, ſince God works in him and with him whatever he does.* Henry Suso, a Dominican monk, and one of the moſt celebrated Myſtic writers, compoſed, in the following century, another *Book concerning the Nine Rocks,* which is to be found in the edition of his works publiſhed by Laurent. Surius. But this book is entirely different from that, which was in ſuch high eſteem among the *Beghards*, though it bears the ſame title. The latter is of much older date, and was in vogue in *Germany*, among the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, long before Suso was born. There fell ſome time ago into my hands an ancient manuſcript, compoſed in Alſace during the xvth century, and containing an account of various *Revelations and Viſions of that age*. In this manuſcript I found a piece entitled, *Declaratio Religioſi cujuſdam ſuper revelatione Carthuſiano cuidam de Eccleſiæ per gladium reformatione, Leodii, A.* 1453, *facta*; and almoſt in the beginning of this declaration the following paſſage relating to the *Book of the Nine Rocks: Homo quidam devotiſſimus, licet Laicus, Librum de novem Rupibus conſcripſit à Deo compulſus, ubi multa ad præſens pertinentia continentur de Eccleſiæ renovatione et prævia gravi perſecutione.* Theſe *Nine Rocks* ſignified, according to the fanatical doctrine of this wrong-headed ſect, the different ſteps by which the divine man aſcended to the Deity.

[a] The founder of this famous ſect, the place of its origin, and the preciſe date of its firſt appearance are not known with any degree of certainty. I have actually in my poſſeſſion *Eighty nine Sentences of the Beghards, vulgarly called Schweſtrones, but who ſtyle themſelves Brethren of the ſect of the Free Spirit and of voluntary Poverty, with a Refutation of the ſaid Sentences,* written at *Worms* towards the concluſion of this century by ſome one or other of the inquiſitors. The 79th of theſe ſentences runs thus: *To ſay that the truth is in* Rhetia, *is to fall into the hereſy of Donatus, who ſaid, that God was in Africa, and not elſewhere.* From theſe words it appears evident, that Rhetia *was the place, where the church of the Brethren of the free ſpirit was fixed and eſtabliſhed*, and that from this province they paſſed into *Germany*. I am not however of opinion, that this ſect had its firſt riſe in that province; but am rather inclined to think that *Italy* was its country, and that, being driven from thence, it took refuge in *Rhetia*. Nor is it at all improbable, that *Italy*, which ſaw ſo many religious factions ariſe in its boſom, was alſo the nurſing mother of this blaſphemous ſect. We ſhall be almoſt fully confirmed in this opinion when we conſider that, in a long letter from Clement V to Rainier biſhop of *Cremona* (publiſhed by Odor. Raynaldus *Annal.* tom. xv. A. 1311, n. 66. p. 90.) the zealous pontif exhorts that prelate to ſuppreſs and extirpate, with all his might, the ſect of the Brethren of the free ſpirit, which was *ſettled in ſeveral parts of Italy, and*

Amalric.

XII. The famous AMALRIC, native of BENE, and profeſſor of logic and theology at *Paris*, whoſe bones were dug up and publicly burnt in the year 1209, although he had abjured his errors before his death, and a conſiderable number of whoſe diſciples and followers were committed to the flames on account of their abſurd and pernicious doctrine, was, undoubtedly, of the ſame way of thinking with the ſect whoſe opinions we have been now conſidering [*b*]. For though the writers of this barbarous age have given very different and confuſed accounts of this man's opinions, and even attributed ſome doctrines to him which he never maintained, it is, nevertheleſs, certain, that he taught, that all things were the parts of one ſubſtance, or, in other words, that the univerſe was God, and that not only the *forms* of all things, but alſo their *matter* or ſubſtance proceeded from the Deity, and muſt return to the ſource from whence they were derived [*c*]. From theſe abſurd and blaſphemous principles he deduced that chimerical ſyſtem of fanatical devotion, which we have already expoſed to the view of the reader, pretended to demonſtrate the poſſibility of incorporating or tranſlating the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worſhip, as inſignificant and uſeleſs. The diſciples of this enthuſiaſt were men of exemplary piety, were diſtinguiſhed by the gravity and auſterity of their lives and manners, and ſuffered death in the moſt dreadful forms with the utmoſt reſolution and conſtancy. One of the moſt eminent among theſe was DAVID of *Dinant*, a Pariſian doctor, who uſually expreſſed the fundamental principle of his maſter in the following propoſition: *God is the primary matter or ſubſtance of all things.* He compoſed a work entitled, *Quaternarii*, with ſeveral other productions, which were chiefly deſigned to affect and gain the multitude: but, after all, was obliged to ſave himſelf

---

particularly in the province of Spoleto and the countries adjacent. Such are the terms of the pontif's letter; *in nonnullis Italiæ partibus, tam Spoletanæ provinciæ, quam circumjacentium regionum.*

[*b*] This did not eſcape the notice of the enemies of the *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, in *Germany*, much leſs that of the *Inquiſitors*, who, in their *Refutation of the* 89 *Sentences of the Beghards* mentioned in the preceding Note, expreſs themſelves thus: (*Sententiâ* 68.) *Dicere quod omnis creatura eſt Deus, hæreſis Alexandri* * *eſt, qui dixit, materiam primam et Deum et Hominem, hoc eſt mentes, eſſe in ſubſtantia, quod poſtea* quidam David de Dinanto *ſequutus eſt, qui temporibus noſtris de hac hæreſi de Francia fugatus eſt, et punitus fuiſſet, ſi deprehenſus fuiſſet.*

[(*c*) The account given by FLEURY, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, of the opinions of AMALRIC, is very different from that which is here given by Dr. MOSHEIM. The *former* obſerves, that AMALRIC, or AMAURI, taught that *every Chriſtian was obliged to believe himſelf a member of Jeſus Chriſt, and that without this belief none could be ſaved*, and he obſerves alſo that his diſciples introduced errors ſtill more pernicious, ſuch as the following: "That the *power* of the *Father* had con-
"tinued only during the Moſaic diſpenſation, that of the *Son* 1200 years after his entrance upon
"earth, and that, in the XIIIth century, the *age of the Holy Spirit* commenced, in which the ſacra-
"ments and all external worſhip were to be aboliſhed; that there would be no reſurrection; that
"heaven and hell were mere fictions," and many more ſentiments of that nature which, as the learned SPANHEIM † imagines, were falſely imputed to AMALRIC, in order to render his memory odious, becauſe he had oppoſed the worſhip of ſaints and images. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſ.* livr. lxxvi. § 59.—Dr. MOSHEIM looks upon AMALRIC to have been a Pantheiſt, and many men of eminent learning are of this opinion. See among others JOH. GERSON apud JAC. THOMASIUM, as alſo BRUCKER'S *Hiſt. Philoſoph.* tom. iii. p. 688.]

* The perſon here mentioned is ALEXANDER, the Epicurean, of whom PLUTARCH ſpeaks in his *Sympoſium*.

† See SPANHEMII *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xxii. p. 1694.

by flight [*d*]. The biſhops, aſſembled in council at *Paris* in the year 1209, conſidered the philoſophy of ARISTOTLE as the ſource of all theſe impious doctrines, and, on that account, prohibited the reading, or explaining, either in public or private, the metaphyſical, and other productions of the Grecian ſtage [*e*].

Joachim. Wilhelmina.

XIII. If we may depend upon the accounts given by certain writers, AMALRIC and his followers received with the utmoſt docility and faith the predictions, attributed to JOACHIM abbot of *Flora*, concerning the reformation that was ſoon to be brought about in the church by the power of the ſword, the approaching *Age of the holy Ghoſt* that was to ſucceed thoſe of the Father and the Son, and other things of that nature, which raiſed the hopes, and occupied the thoughts of the *Spiritual* Franciſcans. Whether theſe accounts may be depended upon or not we ſhall not determine. To us they appear extremely doubtful. It is, however, true, that certain perſons were ſo far deluded by theſe pretended prophecies, as to form new ſects with a view to their accompliſhment, and to declare war againſt the eſtabliſhed church, its ſyſtem of doctrine, and its forms of worſhip. Among other fanatical ſectaries, there aroſe one of a moſt extraordinary kind, a Bohemian woman named *Wilhelmina*, who reſided in the territory of *Milan*. This delirious and wrong-headed woman having ſtudied with attention the predictions concerning the *Age of the holy Ghoſt*, was extravagant enough to perſuade herſelf, and, what is ſtill more amazing, had influence enough to perſuade others, that the holy Ghoſt was become *incarnate* in her perſon for the ſalvation of a great part of mankind. According to her doctrine, "None were ſaved by the blood of JESUS, but true and pious Chriſtians; "while the Jews, Saracens, and unworthy Chriſtians were to obtain ſalvation "through the holy ſpirit which dwelt in her, and that, in conſequence there- "of, all that had happened to CHRIST, during his appearance upon earth in "the human nature, was to be exactly renewed in her perſon, or rather in "that of the holy Ghoſt, which was united to her." This mad-woman died at *Milan* in the year 1281, in the moſt fragrant odour of ſanctity, and her memory was not only held in the higheſt veneration by her numerous followers and the ignorant multitude, but was alſo honoured with religious worſhip both in public and in private. Her ſect, nevertheleſs, was diſcovered by the curious eye of perſecution in the year 1300, and fell into the clutches of the inquiſitors, who deſtroyed the magnificent monument that had been erected in her honour, had her bones raiſed and committed to the flames, and in the ſame fire conſumed the chief leaders of this wretched faction, among which there were perſons of both ſexes [*f*].

[*d*] See MARTENE, *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. iv. p. 163. where there is an account of the hereſies for which ſeveral prieſts were burnt at *Paris* in the year 1209.—NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Hiſt. Eccl. Sæc.* xiii. cap. iii. art. ii. p. 76.—DU BOIS, *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 244.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iii. p. 24. 48. 53.—JAC. THOMASIUS, *De Exuſtione Mundi Stoica*, p. 199.

[*e*] LAUNOIUS, *De varia Ariſtot. fortuna in Acad. Pariſ.* p. 127.

[*f*] The Milaneſe hiſtorians, ſuch as BERNARD, CORIUS, and others, have related the adven-

The ſect called Apoſtles.

XIV. It was upon predictions ſimilar to thoſe mentioned in the preceding ſection, that *the ſect of the apoſtles*, founded its diſcipline. The members of this ſect made little or no alterations in the doctrinal part of the public religion; what they principally aimed at, was, to introduce among Chriſtians the ſimplicity of the primitive times, and more eſpecially the manner of life that was obſerved by the apoſtles. GERHARD SAGARELLI, the founder of this ſect, obliged his followers to go from place to place as the apoſtles did, to wander about cloathed in white, with long beards, diſhevelled hair, and bare heads, accompanied with women, whom they called their *Siſters*. They were alſo obliged to renounce all kinds of property and poſſeſſions, and to preach in public the neceſſity of repentance, while in their more private aſſemblies they declared the approaching deſtruction of the corrupt church of *Rome*, and the eſtabliſhment of a purer ſervice, and a more glorious church, that, according to the prophecies of the abbot JOACHIM, was to ariſe from its ruins. No ſooner was the unhappy leader of this faction committed to the flames [g], than he was ſucceeded in that character by a bold and enterpriſing Fanatic, named DULCINUS, a native of *Novara*, who publiſhed his predictions with more courage and maintained them with more zeal than his predeceſſor had done, and who did not heſitate to declare that, in a ſhort time, the Roman pontif BONIFACE VIII, with the corrupt prieſts and the licentious monks were to periſh by the hand of the emperor FREDERIC III, ſon of PETER, king of *Arragon*, and that a new and moſt holy pontif was to be raiſed to the head of the church. Theſe viſionary predictions were, no doubt, drawn from the dreams of the abbot JOACHIM, who is ſaid to have declared, among other things, that an emperor, called FREDERIC II, was to bring to perfection what FREDERIC II. had left unfiniſhed. Be that as it may, DULCINUS appeared with intrepid aſſurance at the head of the *apoſtles*, and acting not only in the character of a prophet, but alſo in that of a general; he aſſembled an army to maintain his cauſe, and perhaps to accompliſh, at leaſt in part, his predictions. He was oppoſed by RAYNERIUS, biſhop of *Vercelli*, who defended the intereſts of the Roman pontif, and carried on during the ſpace of two years and more, a moſt bloody and dreadful war againſt this chief of the apoſtles. The iſſue of this conteſt was fatal to the latter, who, after ſeveral battles fought with obſtinate courage, was at length taken priſoner, and put to death at *Vercelli* in the moſt barbarous manner in the year 1307, together with *Margaret*, whom he had choſen for his *Spiritual Siſter*, according to the cuſtom of his ſect. The terrible end of DULCINUS was not immediately followed by the downfal of his ſect, which ſtill ſubſiſted in *France*, *Germany*, and in other countries, and ſtood firm

---

tures of this odd woman; but their accounts are very different from thoſe given by the learned MURATORI, in his *Antiqq. Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 91. and which he has drawn from the judicial proceedings, of the court, where the extraordinary caſe of this female fanatic was examined. We are informed by the ſame excellent author, that a learned writer, named PURICELLI, compoſed a hiſtory of WILHELMINA, and of her ſect.

[g] This unhappy man was burnt alive at *Parma*, in the year 1300.

againſt the moſt vehement efforts of its enemies untill the beginning of the xvth century, when, under the pontificate of BONIFACE IX, it was totally extirpated [*b*].

A true account of the hereſy that was imputed to Joachim.

XV. This famous JOACHIM, abbot of *Flora*, whoſe fanatical predictions turned the heads of ſo many well-meaning people, and excited them to attempt reforming the church by the ſword, and to declare open war againſt the Roman pontifs, did not fall under the ſuſpicion of hereſy on account of theſe predictions, but in conſequence of a new explication he had given of the doctrine of a Trinity of perſons in thegodhead. He had in an elaborate work attacked very warmly PETER LOMBARD, the maſter of the ſentences, on account of the diſtinction this latter writer had made between the *divine eſſence*, and the *three perſons* in the godhead; for JOACHIM looked upon this doctrine as introducing a *fourth* object, even an *eſſence*, into the Trinity. But the good man was too little verſed in metaphyſical matters, to carry on a controverſy of ſuch a ſubtile nature, and he was betrayed by his ignorance ſo far as to advance inconſiderately the moſt raſh and exceptionable tenets. For he denied that there was any thing, or any *eſſence*, that belonged in common to the three perſons in the Trinity, or was jointly poſſeſſed by them; by which doctrine the *ſubſtantial* union between the three perſons was taken away, and the unity of the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt was reduced from a *natural*, *ſimple*, and *numerical* unity, to a *moral* one only, that is, to ſuch a unity as reigns in the counſels and opinions of different perſons, who embrace the ſame notions, and think and act with one accord. This explication of the Trinity was looked upon by many as very little different from the Arian ſyſtem, and therefore the Roman pontif, INNOCENT III, pronounced, in the year 1215, in the council of the Lateran a damnatory ſentence againſt the doctrine of JOACHIM, which ſentence, however, did not extend to the perſon or fame of the abbot himſelf. And, indeed, notwithſtanding this papal ſentence, JOACHIM has at this day a conſiderable number of adherents and defenders, more eſpecially among thoſe of the Franciſcans, who are called *Obſervants*. Some of theſe maintain that the book of this abbot was corrupted and interpolated by his enemies, while the reſt are of opinion that his doctrine was not thoroughly underſtood by thoſe that oppoſed it [*i*].

[*b*] I compoſed in the German language an accurate hiſtory, in III books, of this famous ſect, which is very little known in our times, and I have in my hands materials, that will furniſh an intereſting addition to that hiſtory. That this ſect ſubſiſted in *Germany*, and in ſome other countries, until the pontificate of BONIFACE IX, is evident from the *Chronicle* of HERMAN CORNERUS, publiſhed by JO. GEORGE ECCARD, in his *Corpus Hiſtoricum medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 906. and may be ſufficiently demonſtrated by other authentic teſtimonies. In the year 1402, a certain member of this apoſtolical ſect, whoſe name was WILLIAM, or WILHELMUS, was burnt alive at *Lubeck*. See CORNERUS *loc. cit.* p. 1185. The Germans, who were accuſtomed to diſtinguiſh by the name of *Beghards* all thoſe who pretended to extraordinary piety, and ſought, by poverty and begging, an eminent reputation for ſanctity and virtue, gave this title alſo to the ſect of the *Apoſtles*.

[*i*] See DAN. PAPEBROCHIUS, *Diſquiſ. Hiſtor. de Florenſi Ordine, Prophetiis, Doctrina, B. Joachimi*, in *Actis Sanctorum Maii*, tom. vi. p. 486. which contains *The life of Joachim*, and ſeveral other pieces of conſequence. See alſo NATAL. ALEXANDER, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xiii. *Diſſ.* ii. p. 331.—LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 6.

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

Fruitleſs attempts to renew the cruſades.

I. SEVERAL attempts were made by the monarchs and princes of the weſt, ſet on by the inſtigation of the Roman pontifs, to renew the war in *Paleſtine* againſt the Turks and Saracens, and to deliver the whole province of *Syria* from the oppreſſive yoke of theſe deſpotic Infidels. The ſucceſſion of pontifs that reſided at *Avignon* were particularly zealous for the renovation of this religious war, and left no artifice, no methods of perſuaſion unemployed, that could have the leaſt tendency to engage the kings of *England* and *France*, in an expedition to the Holy Land. But their ſucceſs was not anſwerable to their zeal; and notwithſtanding the powerful influence of their exhortations and remonſtrances, ſomething ſtill happened to prevent their producing the deſired effect. CLEMENT V urged the renewal of this holy war with the greateſt ardor in the years 1307, 1308, and ſet apart an immenſe ſum of money for carrying it on with alacrity and vigour [a]. JOHN XXII ordered a fleet of ten ſhips to be fitted out in the year 1319, to tranſport an army of pious adventurers into *Paleſtine* [b], and had recourſe to the power of ſuperſtition, that is, to the influence of *indulgences* for raiſing the funds neceſſary to the ſupport of this great enterprize. Theſe *indulgences* he offered to ſuch as contributed generouſly to the carrying on the war, and appointed legates to adminiſter them in all the countries in *Europe* that were ſubject to his ghoſtly juriſ-

[a] BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 15. 594. tom. ii. p. 55. 57. 374. 391, &c. ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 577.

[b] BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 125. tom. ii. p. 515.

diction. But under this fair ſhew of piety and zeal, JOHN is ſuppoſed to have covered the moſt ſelfiſh and groveling views, and we find LEWIS of *Bavaria*, who was, at that time, emperor, and ſeveral other princes complaining loudly that this pontif made uſe of the holy war as a pretext to diſguiſe his avarice and ambition [*c*]; and indeed the character of this pope was proper to give credit to ſuch complaints. Under the pontificate of BENEDICT XII, a formidable army was raiſed in the year 1330, by PHILIP DE VALOIS, king of *France*, with a view, as was ſaid, to attempt the deliverance of the Chriſtians in *Paleſtine* [*d*]; but when he was juſt ready to embark his troops, the apprehenſion of an invaſion from *England* obliged him to lay aſide this weighty enterprize. In the year 1345, CLEMENT V, at the requeſt of the Venetians, engaged, by the perſuaſive power of *indulgences*, a prodigious number of adventurers to embark for *Smyrna*, where they compoſed a numerous army under the command of GUIDO or GUY, dauphin of *Vienne*; but the want of proviſions obliged this army to return with their general into *Europe* in a ſhort time after their departure [*e*]. This diſappointment did not, however, damp the ſpirits of the reſtleſs pontifs; for another formidable army was aſſembled in the year 1363, in conſequence of the zealous exhortations of URBAN V, and was to be employed in a new expedition againſt the Infidels, with JOHN, king of *France*, at its head; but the unexpected death of that prince blaſted the hopes that many had entertained from this grand project, and occaſioned the diſperſion of that numerous body which had repaired to his ſtandards [*f*].

The ſtate of Chriſtianity in *China* and *Tartary*.

II. The miſſionaries that had been ſent by the Roman pontifs into *China*, *Tartary*, and the adjacent countries in the preceding century, found their labours crowned with the deſired ſucceſs, and eſtabliſhed a great number of Chriſtian churches in theſe unenlightened nations. In the year 1307, CLEMENT V erected *Cambalu* (which at this time was the celebrated metropolis of *Cathay*, and is, undoubtedly, the ſame with *Peking* the capital city, at preſent, of the Chineſe empire) into an archbiſhopric, which he conferred upon JOHN DE MONTE CORVINO, an Italian friar, who had been employed in propagating the goſpel in that country for many years. The ſame pontif ſent ſoon after to aſſiſt this prelate in his pious labours ſeven other biſhops of the Franciſcan order [*g*]. JOHN XXII exerted in this good cauſe the ſame zeal which had diſtinguiſhed the pontificate of his predeceſſors. Upon the death of JOHN DE MONTE CORVINO in the year 1330, he ſent NICOLAS of BENTRA to fill the vacant archbiſhopric of *Cambalu*, and charged him with letters to the emperor of the Tartars, who, at that time, was in poſſeſſion of the Chineſe dominions. In the year 1338, Benedict XII ſent new legates and miſſionaries into *Tartary* and *China*, in conſequence of a ſolemn embaſſy [*b*] with which he was honoured at *Avignon* from the Kan of the Tartars. During the time that the princes of this latter nation maintained themſelves in the empire of *China*, the Chriſtian religion flouriſhed in theſe vaſt regions, and both Latins and Neſtorians not only made a public profeſſion of their faith, but alſo propagated it without any apprehenſion of danger, throughout the northern provinces of *Aſia*.

[*c*] BALUZIUS *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 175. 786.—MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. ii. p. 595. 598.

[*d*] BALUZIUS *loc. cit.* tom. i. p. 200.

[*e*] *Fragmenta Hiſtor. Romanæ*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 368.

[*f*] BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 366. 386. 371. 401.

[*g*] WADDING. *Annal. Ordin. Minor.* tom. vi. *ad A.* 1305. § xii. p. 69. *ad A.* 1307. p. 91. 368. tom. vii. p. 53. 221. tom. viii. p. 235.—J. S. ASSEMANI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. § ii. p. 521.—J. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 537.—*Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Januarii*, p. 984.—MOSHEMII *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Tartar.*

Converſion of the Lithuanians.

III. There remained in this century ſcarcely any European prince, unconverted to Chriſtianity, if we except Jagello, duke of *Lithuania*, who continued in the darkneſs of paganiſm and worſhiped the gods of his idolatrous anceſtors, until the year 1386, when he embraced the Chriſtian faith, received in baptiſm the name of Vladislaus, and perſuaded his ſubjects to open their eyes upon the divine light of the goſpel. We ſhall not pretend to juſtify the purity of the motives that firſt engaged this prince to renounce the religion of his fathers, as they were accompanied, at leaſt, with views of policy, intereſt, and ambition. Upon the death of Lewis, king of *Poland*, which happened in the year 1382, Jagello was named among the competitors who aſpired after the vacant throne; and as he was a rich and powerful prince, the Poles beheld his pretenſions and efforts with a favorable eye. His religion was the only obſtacle that lay in his way to the accompliſhment of his views. Hedwige, the youngeſt daughter of the deceaſed monarch, who, by a decree of the ſenate, was declared heireſs of the kingdom, was as little diſpoſed to eſpouſe, as the Poles were to obey, a Pagan, and hence Jagello was obliged to make ſuperſtition yield to royalty [*i*]. On the other hand the Teutonic knights and cruſaders extirpated by fire and ſword any remains of paganiſm that were yet to be found in *Pruſſia* and *Livonia*, and effected, by force, what perſuaſion alone ought to have produced.

Many of the Jews become Chriſtians through compulſion.

We find alſo in the annals of this century a great many inſtances of Jews converted to the Chriſtian faith. The cruel perſecutions they ſuffered in ſeveral parts of *Europe*, particularly in *France* and *Germany*, vanquiſhed their obſtinacy, and bent their untractable ſpirits under the yoke of the goſpel. The reports (whether falſe or true we ſhall not determine) that had been induſtriouſly ſpred abroad, of their poiſoning the public fountains, of their killing infants and drinking their blood, of their profaning in the moſt impious and blaſphemous manner the conſecrated wafers that were uſed in the celebration of the euchariſt, with other accuſations equally enormous, excited every where the reſentment of the magiſtrates and the fury of the people, and brought the moſt terrible ſufferings, that unrelenting vengeance could invent, upon that wretched and devoted nation.

[*b*] Baluzii *Vitæ Pontificum Avenionenſium*, tom. i. p. 242.

[*i*] Odor. Raynaldus, *Annal. Eccleſ. ad A.* 1386. § iv.—Waddingi *Annal. Minor.* tom. ix. p. 71.—Solignac *Hiſtoire de Pologne*, tom. iii. p. 241.

A ſcheme laid for the expulſion of the Saracens out of *Spain*.

IV. The Saracens maintained as yet a conſiderable footing in *Spain*. The kingdoms of *Granada* and *Murcia*, with the province of *Andaluſia*, were ſubject to their dominion, and they carried on a perpetual war with the kings of *Caſtile*, *Arragon*, and *Navarre*, in which, however, they were not always victorious. The African princes, and particularly the emperors of *Morocco*, became their auxiliaries againſt the Chriſtians. On the other hand, the Roman pontiffs left no means unemployed to excite the Chriſtians to unite their forces againſt the Mahometans, and to drive them out of the Spaniſh territories; preſents, exhortations, promiſes, in ſhort every allurement that religion, ſuperſtition, or avarice could render powerful, were made uſe of in order to the execution of this arduous project. The Chriſtians, accordingly, united their counſels and efforts for this end; and though for ſome time the difficulty of the enterprize rendered their progreſs but inconſiderable, yet even in this century their affairs carried a promiſing aſpect, and gave them reaſon to hope that they ſhould one day triumph over their enemies, and become ſole poſſeſſors of the Spaniſh dominions [k].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The Chriſtian religion loſes ground in *Aſia*.

I. THE Turks and Tartars, who extended their dominions in *Aſia* with an amazing rapidity, and directed their arms againſt the Greeks, as well as againſt the Saracens, deſtroyed wherever they went the fruits that had ſprung up in ſuch a rich abundance from the labours of the Chriſtian miſſionaries, extirpated the religion of JESUS in ſeveral provinces and cities where it flouriſhed, and ſubſtituted the impoſtures of MAHOMET in its place. Many of the Tartars had formerly profeſſed the goſpel, and ſtill more had tolerated the exerciſe of that divine religion; but, from the beginning of this century, things put on a new face, and that fierce nation renounced every other religious doctrine, except that of the Alcoran. TIMUR BEG, commonly called TAMERLANE, their mighty emperor embraced himſelf the doctrine of MAHOMET, though under a form different from that which was adopted by the Tartars in general [l]. This formidable warrior, after having ſubdued the greateſt part of *Aſia*, having triumphed over BAJAZET the emperor of the Turks, and even filled *Europe* with terror at the approach of his victorious arms, made uſe of his authority to force multitudes of Chriſtians to apoſtatize from their holy faith. To the dictates of authority he added the compulſive power of violence and perſecution, and treated the diſciples of Christ with the utmoſt barbarity. Perſuaded, as we learn from the moſt credible writers of his life and actions, that it was incumbent upon the true followers of Mahomet, to perſecute the Chriſtians, and that the moſt ample and glorious rewards were reſerved for ſuch, as were moſt inſtrumental in converting them to the Mahometan faith [m]; he employed the moſt inhuman acts of ſeverity to vanquiſh the magnanimous conſtancy of thoſe that perſevered in their attachment to the Chriſtian religion, of whom ſome ſuffered death in the moſt barbarous forms, while others were condemned to perpetual ſlavery [n].

---

[k] See JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hiſtoire de l'Eſpagne*, tom. iv, v. vii.—*Fragmenta Hiſtor. Romanæ*, in MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 319. in which, however, there is a conſiderable mixture of truth and falſhood.—BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. ii. p. 267.

[l] This great TAMERLANE, whoſe name ſeemed to ſtrike terror, even when he was no more, adhered to the ſect of the *Sonnites*, and profeſſed the greateſt enmity againſt their adverſaries the *Schiites*. See PETIT CROIX, *Hiſtoire de Timur-Bec*, tom. ii. p. 151. tom. iii. p. 228. It is, however, extremely doubtful, what was, in reality, the religion of TAMERLANE, though he profeſſed the Mahometan faith. See MOSHEIM, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Tartaror.* p. 124.

The decline of Chriſtianity in *China* and in *Tartary*.

II. In thoſe parts of *Aſia*, that are inhabited by the Chineſe, Tartars, Moguls, and other nations as yet leſs known, the Chriſtian religion not only loſt ground, but ſeemed to be totally extirpated. It is, at leaſt, certain, that we have no account of any members of the Latin church reſiding in thoſe countries later than the year 1370, nor could we ever learn the fate of the Franciſcan miſſionaries that had been ſent thither from *Rome*. We have, indeed, ſome records, from which it would appear that there were Neſtorians reſiding in *China* ſo far down as the ſixteenth century [o]; but theſe records are not ſo clear in relation to this matter, as to remove all uncertainty and doubting. Be that as it may, it is evident beyond all contradiction, that the abolition of Chriſtianity, in thoſe remote parts of the world, was owing to the wars that were carried on by the Tartars againſt the Chineſe and other Aſiatic nations; for in the year 1369, the laſt emperor of the race of Gengis Kan was driven out of *China*, and his throne filled by the *Mim* family, who, by a ſolemn law, refuſed to all foreigners the privilege of entering into *China*.

---

[m] Petit Croix, *Hiſtoire de Timur-Bec*, tom. ii. p. 329. tom. iii. p. 9. 137. 243, &c.

[n] Many inſtances of this we find in a *Hiſtory of Timur-Bec*, wrote by a Perſian, who was named Scherfedinus, tom. ii. p. 376. 384. 386. tom. iii. p. 243. tom. iv. p. 111. 115. 117. and publiſhed at *Delft*, in four volumes 8vo. in the year 1723.—See alſo Herbelot, *Biblioth. Oriental.* at the article *Timur*, p. 877.

[o] Nicol. Trigautius, *De Chriſtiana expeditione apud Sinas*, lib. i. cap. xi. p. 116.—Jos. Sim. Assemani *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. I. p. 592. & part. II. p. 445. 536.—Halde, *Deſcription de la Chine*, tom. i. p. 175.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

The ſtate of letters among the Greeks.

I. THE Greeks, though dejected by the foreign and inteſtine calamities in which they were involved, were far from withdrawing their attention and zeal from the cauſe of learning, as is evident from the great number of learned men who flouriſhed among them during this period. In this honourable claſs were NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, MANUEL CHRYSOLORAS, MAXIMUS PLANUDES, and many others, who, by their indefatigable application to the ſtudy of humanity and antiquities, criticiſm and grammar, acquired conſiderable reputation. To omit writers of inferior note, THEODORUS METOCHILA, JOHN CANTACUZENUS, and NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, applied themſelves to the compoſition of hiſtory, though with different ſucceſs. Nor ought we to paſs over in ſilence NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, who compiled an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which, notwithſtanding its being debaſed with idle ſtories, and evident marks of ſuperſtition, is highly uſeful on account of the light it caſts on many important facts.

The ſtate of philoſophy among the Greeks.

II. As none of the ſages in this century was adventurous enough to ſet up for a leader in philoſophy, ſuch of the Greeks as had a taſte for philoſophical reſearches adhered to ARISTOTLE, as their conductor and guide; but we may learn from the tracts of THEODORUS METOCHITA in what manner they explained the principles and tenets of the Stagirite. PLATO alſo had his followers, eſpecially among thoſe who were fond of myſticiſm, which had for many ages been held in the higheſt veneration by the Greeks. In the ſublime ſciences of mathematics and aſtronomy NICOLAS CABASILAS ſurpaſſed all his contemporaries. BARLAAM adopted the ſentiments and precepts of the Stoics with reſpect to the obligations of morality and the duties of life, and digeſted them into a work of his, which is known by the title of *Ethica ex Stoicis* [q].

The ſtate of learning among the Latins.

III. In all the Latin provinces ſchemes were laid and carried into execution with conſiderable ſucceſs, for promoting the ſtudy of letters, improving taſte, and diſpelling the pedantic ſpirit of the times. This laudable diſpoſition gave riſe to the erection of many ſchools and academies, at *Cologn*, *Orleans*, *Cahors*, *Peruſia*, *Florence*, and *Piſa*, in which all the liberal arts and ſciences, diſtributed into the ſame claſſes that ſtill ſubſiſt in thoſe places, were taught with aſſiduity and zeal. Opulent perſons founded and amply endowed particular *colleges* in the public univerſities, in which, beſides the *monks*, young men of narrow circumſtances were educated in all the branches of litterature. Libraries were alſo collected, and men of learning animated to aſpire to fame and glory, by the proſpect of honourable rewards. It muſt be confeſſed indeed that the advantages ariſing to the church and ſtate, from ſo many profeſſors and learned men, did not wholly anſwer the expenſe and care beſtowed on this undertaking, by men of rank and fortune: yet we are by no means to conclude, as many have raſhly done, that all the doctors of this age, who roſe gradually from the lower to the higher, and more honourable ſtations, were only diſtinguiſhed by their ſtupidity and ignorance.

---

[q] HENRICI CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 405.

The ſtate of languages.

IV. CLEMENT V, who was now raiſed to the pontificate, ordered the Hebrew, and other oriental languages, to be taught in the public ſchools, that the church might never want a ſufficient number of miſſionaries properly qualified to diſpute with the Jews and Mahometans, and to diffuſe the divine light of the goſpel throughout the eaſt [r]: in conſequence of which appointment, ſome eminent proficients in thoſe tongues, and eſpecially in the Hebrew, flouriſhed during this age. The Greek language, which hitherto had been much neglected, was now revived, and taught with general applauſe, firſt of all by LEONTIUS PILATUS, a Calabrian, who wrote a commentary upon HOMER, and a few others [s], but afterwards, with far greater ſucceſs and reputation, by MANUEL CHRYSOLORAS [t], a native of *Conſtantinople*. Nor were there wanting ſome extraordinary geniuſes, who, by their zeal and application, contributed to the reſtoration of the ancient and genuine eloquence of the Latins, among whom the excellent and juſtly-renowned PETRARCH held the firſt place [v], and DANTE ALIGHIERI II. Full of this worthy deſign, they both acted as if they had received an extraordinary commiſſion to promote the reign of true taſte and the progreſs of polite learning; and their ſucceſs was anſwerable to the generous ambition that animated their efforts; for they had many followers and admirers, not only among their countrymen, but alſo among the French and Germans.

Of the other ſciences.

V. The writings of this age furniſh us with a long liſt of grammarians, hiſtorians, lawyers, and phyſicians, of which it would be eaſy to give a circumſtantial account: but as it is quite foreign to our purpoſe, it will be ſufficient to inform our readers that there were but few of this vaſt multitude, whoſe labours were in any great degree uſeful to ſociety. Great numbers applied themſelves to the ſtudy of the *civil* and *canon* law, becauſe it was the readieſt way to preferment both in church and ſtate. Such as have any tolerable acquaintance with hiſtory, cannot be entire ſtrangers to the fame of BARTOLUS, BALDUS, ANDREWS, and other doctors of laws in this century, who reflected honour on the univerſities of *Italy*. But after all, it is certain that the juriſprudence of this age was a moſt intricate diſagreeable ſtudy, unenlivened either by hiſtory or language, and deſtitute of every allurement that could recommend it to a man of genius. As for the mathematics, they were cultivated by many, yet, if we except THOMAS BRADWARDINE, the acute and learned archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, there were but few who acquired any reputation worth mentioning by this kind of ſtudy.

---

[r] See ANT. WOOD, *Antiq. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 156. 159.

[s] See HUMPH. HODY, *De Græcis illuſtribus, Linguæ Græcæ Litterarumque humaniorum inſtauratoribus*, lib. i. p. 5. *Londini* 1742, in 8^{vo}.—CALOGERA, *Opuſculi Scientifici*, tom. XXV. p. 258.

[t] HODY *loc. cit.* lib. i. p. 10.—ANGELI CALOGERÆ *loc. cit.* p. 248.—And more eſpecially CHRIST. FRID. BORNERI *Lib. de Græcis Litterarum Græcarum in Italia inſtauratoribus.*

[v] See JAC. PHIL. THOMASINI *vita Petrarchi* in JO. GERH. MEUSCHEN *Vitæ claror. viror.* tom. iv. who in his Preface enumerates all the other writers of his life. Of the celebrated poet DANTE, ſeveral have treated, particularly his tranſlator BENEVENUTUS of *Imola*, from whence MURATORIUS has borrowed large extracts in his *Antiquit. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1036. *ſ.*

Of philoſophy.

VI. The vaſt number of philoſophers, who rather diſgraced than adorned this century, looked upon ARISTOTLE as their infallible oracle and guide; though they ſtript him of all thoſe excellences that really belonged to him, and were incapable of entering into the true ſpirit of his writings. So great was the authority of the peripatetic philoſophy, that, in order to diffuſe the knowledge of it as widely as poſſible, even kings, and emperours, ordered the works of ARISTOTLE to be tranſlated into the native language of their reſpective dominions. Among the moſt eminent of this claſs was CHARLES V, king of *France*, who ordered all the writings of the ancients, and eſpecially thoſe of ARISTOTLE, to be tranſlated into French by NICHOLAS ORESME [u]. Thoſe, however, who profeſſed themſelves philoſophers, inſtead of being animated by the love of truth, were inflamed by a rage of diſputation, which led them to perplex, and deform the pure, ſimple, doctrines of reaſon and religion, by a multitude of idle ſubtilties, trifling queſtions, and ridiculous diſtinctions. It is needleſs to enlarge on the barbarity of their phraſeology, in which they ſuppoſed the whole ſtrength of their art conſiſted; as alſo on that utter averſion to every branch of polite learning in which they fooliſhly gloried. Thoſe who have a mind to be acquainted with their methods of argumentation, and whatever elſe relates to this wrangling tribe, need only conſult JOHN SCOTUS, or WALTER BULÆUS. But though they all followed one common track, there were ſeveral points on which they differed among themſelves.

The Realiſts and Nominaliſts.

VII. The old diſputes between the *Realiſts* and *Nominaliſts*, which had lain dormant a long time, were now revived with unexſtinguiſhable ardor, by an Engliſh Franciſcan friar of the ſeverer order, named WILLIAM OCCAM, who was a follower of the great SCOTUS, and a doctor of divinity at *Paris*. The Greeks and Perſians never fought againſt each other with more hatred and fury, than was expreſſed in their contentions by theſe two diſcordant ſects, whoſe angry diſputations ſubſiſted without any abatement, till the appearance of LUTHER, who ſoon obliged the ſcholaſtic divines to terminate their mutual wranglings, and eſtabliſh a peace. The *Realiſts* deſpiſed their antagoniſts as philoſophers of a recent date, branding them with the name of *Moderns*, while, through a great miſtake, they aſcribed a very high antiquity to the tenets of their own party. The *Nominaliſts* on the other hand, inveighed againſt them as a ſet of doating viſionaries, who, deſpiſing ſubſtantial matters, were purſuing mere ſhadows. The *Nominaliſts* had the moſt eloquent, acute, and ſubtile doctors of *Paris* for their leaders, among whom, beſides OCCAM, the famous JOHN BURIDAN [x], was very eminent: nevertheleſs, through the countenance given them by ſucceſſive popes, the *Realiſts* prevailed. For when OCCAM joined the party of the Franciſcan monks, who ſtrenuouſly oppoſed JOHN XXII, that pope himſelf, and his ſucceſſors after him, left no means untryed to extirpate the philoſophy of the *Nominaliſts*, which was deemed highly prejudicial to the intereſts of the church [y]: and hence it was, that, in the year 1339, the univerſity of *Paris*, by a public edict, ſolemnly condemned and prohibited the philoſophy of OCCAM, which was that of the *Nominaliſts* [z]. But, as it is natural for men to love and purſue what is forbidden, the conſequence was, that the party of the *Nominaliſts* flouriſhed more than ever.

---

[u] JO. LAUNOIUS *Hiſt. Gymnaſ. Navarr.* tom. iv. Opp. part. I. p. 504.—BOULAY *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 379.—LE BOEUF, *Diſſert. ſur l'Hiſt. Eccleſ. et Civile, Par.* tom. iii. p. 456. 463. ſ.

Aſtrology mingles itſelf with the philoſophy of the times, and is conſidered as magic.

VIII. Among the philoſophers of theſe times, there were many who ~~mingled aſtrology with their philoſophy, *i. e.* the art of telling fortunes,~~ by the aſpect of the heavens, and the influence of the ſtars; and notwithſtanding the obvious folly and abſurdity of this pretended ſcience, all ranks of people, from the higheſt down to the loweſt, were fond of it even to diſtraction. Yet, in ſpite of all this popular prejudice in favour of their art, theſe aſtrological philoſophers, to avoid being impeached of witchcraft, and to keep themſelves out of the hands of the inquiſitors, were obliged to behave with great circumſpection. The neglect of this caution was remarkably fatal to CECCUS ASCULANUS, a famous peripatetic philoſopher, aſtrologer, and mathematician, firſt of all phyſician to pope JOHN XXII, and afterwards to CHARLES SINETERRA, duke of *Calabria*. This unhappy man having performed ſome experiments in mechanics, that ſeemed miraculous to the vulgar, and having alſo offended many, and among the reſt his maſter, by giving out ſome predictions, which were ſaid to have been fulfilled, was univerſally ſuppoſed to deal with infernal ſpirits, and burnt for it by the inquiſitors at *Florence*, in the year 1337 [a]. There is yet extant a commentary of his upon the *Sphere of John de Sacrobuſco*, otherwiſe named *Holywood*, which ſhews its author to have been deeply tainted with ſuperſtition [b].

The philoſophy of Lully.

IX. RAYMUND LULLY was the author of a new and very ſingular kind of philoſophy, which he endeavoured to illuſtrate and defend by his voluminous writings. He was a native of *Majorca*, and a man of an admirable, fruitful genius, yet, at the ſame time, a ſtrange compound of reaſon and folly. Being full of zeal for the propagation of the goſpel, and having performed many voyages, and undergone various hardſhips to promote it, he was ſlain at *Bugia*, in *Africa*, in the 1315, by the Mahometans whom he was attempting to convert. The Franciſcans, to whoſe third order it is ſaid he belonged, extol him to the ſkies, and have taken great pains to perſuade ſeveral popes to canonize him: while many on the contrary, and eſpecially the Dominicans, inveigh bitterly againſt him, calling him a hare-brained chemiſt, a hot-headed fanatic, a heretic, a magician, and a mere compiler of the works of the more learned Mahometans. The popes entertained different opinions of him; ſome eſteeming him a harmleſs pious man, while others pronounced him a vile heretic. But whoever peruſes the writings of LULLY without prejudice, will not be biaſſed by either of theſe parties. It is at leaſt certain, that he would have been a great man, had the warmth and fertility of his imagination been tempered with a ſound judgment [*c*].

---

[x] ROB. GUAGINUS wrote a particular account of this famous man, as we learn from JO. LAUNOIUS, in his *Hiſtoria Gymnaſii Navarreni*, tom. iv. Opp. part. i. p. 722. ſee alſo p. 296. 297. 330. and BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 282. 307. 341, &c.

[y] STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellanea*, tom. iv. p. 532.

[z] BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 257. tom. v. p. 708.—CAR. PLESS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, &c. ſee MOSHEIM.

[a] PAUL ANTON. APPIANUS wrote a Defence of this unhappy man, which is inſerted in DOMEN. BERNINI *Storia di tutte l'hereſie*, tom. iii. ſæc. xiv. cap. iii. p. 210. ſ. We have alſo a further account of him in JO. MARIA CRESCIMBENUS *Commentarj della volgar. Poëſia*, vol. ii. part. II. lib. iii. cap. xiv.

[b] GABR. NAUDÆUS, *Apologie pour les grands hommes qui ont eté ſoupſonnez de Magie*, p. 270. ſ.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and government of the church during this century.

The corrupt ſtate of the clergy.

I. THE governors of the church in this period, from the higheſt to the loweſt orders, were addicted to vices peculiarly diſhonourable to their ſacred character. We ſhall ſay nothing of the Grecian and Oriental clergy, who lived, for the moſt part, under a rigid, ſevere, and oppreſſive government, though they deſerve their part in this heavy and ignominious charge. But with regard to the Latins our ſilence would be inexcuſable, ſince the flagrant abuſes that prevailed among them were attended with conſequences equally pernicious to the intereſts of religion and the well-being of civil ſociety. It is, however, neceſſary to obſerve, that there were, even in theſe degenerate times, ſeveral pious and worthy men, who ardently longed for a reformation of the church, both in *its head and members*, as they uſed to expreſs themſelves [*d*]. Laudable as theſe deſires undoubtedly were, many circumſtances occurred to prevent their accompliſhment; ſuch as the exorbitant power of the popes, ſo confirmed by length of time that it ſeemed immoveable, the exceſſive ſuperſtition that enſlaved the minds of the generality, together with the wretched ignorance and barbarity of the age, by which every ſpark of truth, was ſtifled, as it were in its very birth. Yet firm and laſting as the dominion of the Romon pontifs ſeemed to be, it was gradually undermined and weakened, partly by the pride and raſhneſs of the popes themſelves, and partly by ſeveral unexpected events.

[*c*] See JOHN SALZINGER's Preface to RAYMUND LULLY's Works, which JOHN WILLIAM, elector *Palatine*, cauſed to be collected at a great expenſe, and to be publiſhed, in 1720, in five folio volumes. LUC. WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 421. tom. v. p. 157. 316. tom. vi. p. 229. Concerning the famous invention of LULLY, ſee DAN. GEORG. MORHOFIUS, *Polyhiſtore*, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 352. *ſ*.

[*d*] MATT. FLACIUS, *Catalogo teſtium veritatis*, lib. xiii. p. 1697. JO. LAUNOIUS, *De varia forma Ariſtotelis*, p. 217. JO. HENR. HOTTINGERI *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. Sæc.* xiv. p. 754.

II. The

Philip king of *France* oppoſes the papal tyranny.

II. This important change may be dated from the quarrel which aroſe between BONIFACE VIII, who filled the papal throne about the beginning of this century, and PHILIP the Fair, king of *France*. This prince, who was endowed with a bold and enterprizing ſpirit, ſoon convinced *Europe*, that it was poſſible to ſet bounds to the overgrown arrogance of the biſhop of *Rome*, notwithſtanding many crowned heads had attempted it without ſucceſs. BONIFACE ſent PHILIP the haughtieſt letters imaginable, in which he aſſerted, that the king of *France*, with all other kings and princes whatſoever, were obliged, by a divine command, to ſubmit to the authority of the popes, as well in all political and civil matters, as in thoſe of a religious nature. The king anſwered him with great ſpirit, and in terms expreſſive of the utmoſt contempt. The pope rejoined with more arrogance than ever; and, in that famous *bull*, *unam ſanctam*, which he publiſhed about this time, aſſerted that JESUS CHRIST had granted a twofold power to his church, or, in other words, *the ſpiritual* and *temporal ſword*; that he had ſubjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman pontif, and that whoever dared to diſbelieve it, were to be deemed heretics, and ſtood excluded from all poſſibility of ſalvation [e]. The king, on the other hand, in an aſſembly of the peers of his kingdom, held in the year 1303, ordered WILLIAM DE NOGARET, a celebrated lawyer [f], to draw up an accuſation againſt the pope, in which he publicly charged him with *hereſies*, *ſimony*, and many other vices, demanding, at the ſame time, an oecumenical council to depoſe ſuch an execrable pontif. The pope, in his turn, paſſed a ſentence of excommunication, that very year, againſt the king, and all his adherents.

The event of this warm conteſt.

III. PHILIP, ſhortly after he received his ſentence, held an aſſembly of the ſtates of the kingdom, where he again employed ſome perſons of the higheſt rank and reputation to ſit in judgment upon the pope, and appealed to a general council. After this he ſent WILLIAM DE NOGARET, with ſome others into *Italy*, to excite a ſedition, to ſeize the pope's perſon, and then to convey him to *Lyons*, where the king was determined to hold the abovementioned council. NOGARET, being a reſolute active man, ſoon drew over to his aſſiſtance the powerful family of the Colonnas, then at variance with the pope, levied a ſmall army, ſeized BONIFACE, who lived in perfect ſecurity at *Anagni*, and as ſoon as he had got him into his power treated him in the moſt ſhocking manner, and even carried his outrage ſo far as to wound him on the head by a blow with his iron gauntlet. The inhabitants of *Anagni* reſcued him out of the hands of this fierce and inveterate enemy, conducted him to *Rome*, where he died ſoon after of an illneſs occaſioned by the rage and anguiſh into which theſe inſults had thrown him [g].

---

[e] This *bull* is yet extant in the *Corpus Juris Canon. Extravagant. Commun.* lib. i. *tit. De majoritate et obedientia.*

[f] Of this celebrated lawyer, who was the moſt intrepid and inveterate enemy the popes ever had before LUTHER, none have given us a fuller account than the Benedictine monks. *Hiſt. Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 114. 117. *ſ.* PHILIP made him chancellor of *France* for his reſolute oppoſition againſt the pope.

[g] See the *Acta inter Bonifacium* VIII, *Bened.* XI, *Clement.* V, *et Philippum Pulchrum*, publiſhed A. D. 1614, by PETER PUTEANUS.—ADR. BAILLET, *Hiſt. de Demelez du Boniface* VIII,

The papal reſidence removed to *Avignon*.

IV. **Benedict XI**, who ſucceeded him, and whoſe name before his acceſſion to the papal chair, was **Nicolas Boccacini**, learned prudence by this fatal example, and purſued more moderate and gentle meaſures. He repealed, of his own accord, the ſentence of excommunication that his predeceſſor had thundered out againſt the king of *France* and his dominions, but never could be prevailed upon to abſolve **Nogaret** of his treaſon againſt the ghoſtly majeſty of the pontificate. **Nogaret**, on the other hand, ſet a ſmall value upon the papal abſolution, and proſecuted, with his uſual vigour and intrepidity, in the Roman court the accuſation that he had formerly brought againſt **Boniface**, and, in the name of his royal maſter, inſiſted, that the memory of that pontif ſhould be branded with a notorious mark of infamy. While this was tranſacting **Benedict** died A. D. 1304; upon which **Philip**, by his artful intrigues in the conclave, obtained the ſee of *Rome* for a French prelate **Bertrand de Got**, archbiſhop of *Bourdeaux*, who was accordingly elected to that high dignity, on the 5th of June 1305. This ſtep was ſo much the more neceſſary, in that the breach between the king and the court of *Rome* was not yet entirely healed, and, as **Nogaret** was not as yet abſolved, might eaſily be renewed. Beſides, the French monarch, inflamed with the deſire of revenge, inſiſted upon the formal condemnation of **Boniface** by the court of *Rome*, the abolition of the order of *Templars*, and other conceſſions of great importance, which he could not reaſonably expect from an Italian pope. Hence he looked upon a French pontif, in whoſe zeal and compliance he could confide, as neceſſary to the execution of his deſigns. **Bertrand** aſſumed the name of **Clement V**, and, at the king's requeſt, remained in *France*, and removed the papal reſidence to *Avignon*, where it continued during the ſpace of ſeventy years. This period the Italians call, by way of deriſion, the Babyloniſh captivity [h].

The diminution of the papal authority.

V. There is no doubt, but that the continued reſidence of the popes in *France*, greatly impaired the authority of the Roman ſee. For during the abſence of the pontifs from *Rome*, the faction of the *Gibellines*, their inveterate enemies, roſe to a greater height than ever; inſomuch, that they not only invaded, and ravaged *St. Peter's patrimony*, but even attacked the papal authority, by their writings. This cauſed many cities to revolt from the popes: even *Rome*, itſelf was the grand ſource and fomenter of cabals, tumults, and civil wars; inſomuch, that the laws and decrees ſent thither from *France*, were publicly treated with contempt by the common people, as well as by the nobles [i]. The influence of this example was propagated

---

avec Philippe de Bel, printed at *Paris* in 4to. in 1718.—**Jo. Rubeus** *in Bonifacio*, cap. xvi. p. 137.—The other writers on this ſubject are mentioned by **Baillet**, in his Preface, p. 9.—See alſo **Boulay**, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 4.

[h] For an account of the French popes conſult chiefly **Steph. Baluzii** *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionenſium*, publiſhed at *Paris* in two volumes 4to. in the year 1693. The reader may alſo peruſe, but it muſt be with the utmoſt caution, **Longueval's** *Hiſtory of the Gallican Church*, and thoſe who continued that work after his death. See more eſpecially *tom.* xii. This jeſuit, and his ſucceſſors, have ſhewn great induſtry and eloquence in the compoſition of this hiſtory; but they, for the moſt part, artfully conceal the vices and enormities of the Roman pontifs.

[i] See **Baluzii** *Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 290, 291. 301. 309. 323. and many other

from *Italy* through moſt parts of *Europe*; it being evident, from a vaſt number of inſtances, that the Europeans in general did not pay near ſo much regard to the decrees and thunders of the Gallic popes, as they did to thoſe of *Rome*. This gave riſe to various ſeditions againſt the pontifs, which they could not entirely cruſh, even with the aid of the *inquiſitors*, who exerted themſelves with the moſt barbarous fury.

New ſchemes invented by the popes to acquire riches.

VI. The French pontifs finding they could draw but ſmall revenues from their Italian dominions, which were now torn in pieces by faction, and ravaged by ſedition, were obliged to contrive new methods of accumulating wealth. For this purpoſe they not only ſold *indulgences* to the people, more frequently than they had formerly done, whereby they made themſelves extremely odious to ſeveral potentates, but alſo diſpoſed publicly of ſcandalous licences, of all ſorts, at an exceſſive price. JOHN XXII was remarkably ſhrewd and zealous in promoting this abominable traffic; for though he was not the firſt inventor of the *taxes and rules of the apoſtolical chancery*, yet the Romiſh writers acknowledge that he enlarged and rendered them more extenſively profitable to the holy treaſury [k]. It is certain, that the origin of the tribute paid to the popes under the name of *Annates*, and which is generally affirmed to have been firſt impoſed by him, is of a much earlier date [l]. Beſides the abuſes now mentioned, theſe Gallic popes, having aboliſhed the right of elections, arrogated to themſelves a power of conferring all the offices of the church, whether greater or ſmaller, according to their fancy, by which they ſoon amaſſed prodigious wealth. It was alſo under their government that *reſerves*, *proviſions*, *expectatives*, and other impoſitions of the like odious nature, that had ſeldom or never been heard of before, became familiar to the public ear, and filled all *Europe* with bitter complaints [m]. Theſe complaints exceeded all bounds, when ſome of theſe pontifs, particularly JOHN XXII, CLEMENT VI, and GREGORY X, openly declared that they had *reſerved* to themſelves all churches and pariſhes within their juriſdiction, and were determined, in conſequence of that ſovereign authority and *plenitude of power* which CHRIST had conferred upon them, his vicars, to *provide* for them and diſpoſe of them without exception [n]. It was by theſe and other ſuch mean and ſelfiſh contrivances, which had no other end than the acquiſition of riches, that theſe inconſiderate pontifs excited a general hatred againſt the Roman ſee, and thereby

---

places.—MURATORII *Antiqq. Ital.* tom. iii. p. 397. 401. 409, &c.—GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire de Naples*, tom. iii. p. 280.

[k] JO. CIAMPINUS, *De Vicecancellario eccleſiæ Rom.* p. 39.—CAR. CHAIS, *Lettres ſur les Jubiles*, tom. ii p. 673. and others

[l] BERNH. van ESPEN, *Jus Eccleſ. univerſale*, tom. ii p. 876.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 911.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 213.—GUIL. FRANC. BERTHIER. *Diſſ. ſur les Annates*, tom. xii. *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallic.* p. 1.

[m] STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. ii. p. 479. 518. *Ejus Vit Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 60. 63. 65. 74. 154. 156. *Gallia Chriſtiana Benedictinor.* tom. i. Append. p. 13. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 148. 201, 202. BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 911.

[n] BALUZII *Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 873. tom. i. p. 285. 311. 681. *ſ.* ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. v. p. 349. *ſ.* *Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. i. p. 69. 1208. *Hiſtoire du droit Eccleſ. François*, tom. ii. p. 129. *ſ.*

greatly weakened the papal empire which had been viſibly upon the decline from the time of BONIFACE.

The obſequiouſneſs of Clement V to Philip.

VII. CLEMENT V was a mere creature of PHILIP the Fair, and was abſolutely directed and governed by that prince as long as he lived. WILLIAM DE NOGARET, the implacable enemy of BONIFACE VIII, notwithſtanding he was under a ſentence of excommunication, had the boldneſs to proſecute his maſter's cauſe, and his own, againſt BONIFACE, even in the pope's court; an inſtance of aſſurance this, not eaſy to be paralleled. PHILIP inſiſted, that the dead body of BONIFACE ſhould be dug up, and publicly burnt; but CLEMENT averted this infamy by his advice and intreaties, promiſing implicit obedience to the king in every thing elſe. In order therefore to keep his word, he was obliged to abrogate the laws enacted by BONIFACE, to grant the king a bounty of five years tithes, fully to abſolve NOGARET of all his crimes, on condition of his ſubmitting to a light penance (which, however, he never performed) to reſtore the citizens of *Anagni* to their reputation and honour, and to call a general council at *Vienne* in the year 1311, in order to condemn the Templars, on whoſe deſtruction PHILIP was moſt ardently bent. In this council every thing was determined as the king thought proper. For CLEMENT, terrified by the melancholy fate of BONIFACE, durſt not venture to oppoſe this intrepid and obſtinate monarch [o].

John XXII. Nicholas V.

VIII. Upon CLEMENT's death, which happened in the year 1314, many fierce contentions aroſe in the conclave about chooſing a ſucceſſor, the French cardinals inſiſting upon a French, and thoſe of *Italy* demanding an Italian pope. After two years altercations however, the French party prevailed, and, in the year 1316, elected JAMES DE EUSE, a native of *Cahors*, and cardinal biſhop of *Porto*. He aſſumed the name of JOHN XXII, and had a tolerable ſhare of learning, but was at the ſame time crafty and proud, weak, imprudent, and covetous, which is allowed even by thoſe writers who, in other reſpects, ſpeak well of him. He is deſervedly cenſured on account of his temerity, and the ill ſucceſs that attended him, through his own imprudence, in many of his enterprizes; but he is more eſpecially blamed for that calamitous and unhappy war into which he entered againſt LEWIS of *Bavaria*. This powerful prince diſputed the imperial throne of *Germany* with FREDERIC, duke of *Auſtria*, and they had been both choſen to that high dignity, in the year 1314, by their reſpective partiſans among the electors and princes of the empire. JOHN took it for granted, that the deciſion of this conteſt came under his ghoſtly juriſdiction. But, in the year 1322, the duke of *Bavaria* having vanquiſhed his competitor by force of arms, took upon him the adminiſtration of the empire without aſking the pope's approbation, and would by no means allow, that their diſpute, already determined by the ſword, ſhould be again decided by the judgment of the pope. JOHN interpreted this refuſal as a heinous inſult upon his authority, and, by an edict iſſued out in the year 1324, pretended to deprive the emperor of his crown. But his impotent reſentment was very little regarded;

---

[o] Beſides the common writers already cited, ſee GUIL. FRANC. BERTHIERII *Diſcours ſur le Pontificat. de Clement* V, tom. iii. *Hiſtoriæ Eccleſ. Gallic.* COLONIA, *Hiſt. Litter. de Lyon,* tom. i. p. 340. *Gallia Chriſtiana Benedict.* tom. i. p. 1189. & tom. ii. p. 829.

nay, he was even accuſed of hereſy by the emperor, who, at the ſame time, appealed to a general council. Highly exaſperated by theſe and other deſerved affronts, the pontif preſumes, in the year 1327, to declare the imperial throne vacant a ſecond time, and even to publiſh a ſentence of excommunication againſt the chief of the empire. This new mark of papal arrogance was ſeverely reſented by Lewis, who, in the year 1328, publiſhed an edict at *Rome*, by which John was declared unworthy of the pontificate, depoſed from that dignity, and ſucceeded in it by one of his bittereſt enemies Peter de Corbieri, a Franciſcan monk, who aſſumed the name of Nicolas V, and crowned the emperor at *Rome* in a ſolemn and public manner. But, in the year 1330, this *imperial* pope voluntarily abdicated the chair of *St. Peter*, and ſurrendered himſelf to John, who kept him in cloſe confinement at *Avignon* for the reſt of his days. Thus ended the conteſt between the duke of *Bavaria* and John XXII, who, notwithſtanding their mutual efforts to dethrone each other, continued both in the poſſeſſion of their reſpective dignities [p].

John XXII accuſed of hereſy.

IX. The numerous tribes of the *Fratricelli*, *Beghards*, and *Spiritual Franciſcans* adhered to the party of Lewis. Supported by his patronage, and diſperſed throughout the greateſt part of *Europe*, they attacked every where the reigning pontif, as an enemy to the true religion, and loaded him with the heavieſt accuſations and the bittereſt invectives, both in their writings and in their ordinary converſation. Theſe attacks did not greatly affect the pontif, as they were made only by private perſons, by a ſet of obſcure monks, who, in many reſpects, were unworthy of his notice; but towards the concluſion of his life he incurred the diſapprobation and cenſures of almoſt the whole Catholic church. For in the year 1331 and 1332, having aſſerted, in ſome public diſcourſes, that the ſouls of the faithful, in their intermediate ſtate, were permitted to behold Christ as man, but not the *face of God*, or the divine nature, before their reunion with the body at the laſt day, this doctrine highly offended Philip VI, king of *France*, was oppoſed by the pope's friends as well as by his enemies, and unanimouſly condemned by the divines of *Paris*, in the year 1333. This favourite tenet of the pope was thus ſeverely treated, becauſe it ſeemed highly prejudicial to the felicity of happy ſpirits in their unembodied ſtate; otherwiſe the point might have been yielded to a man of his poſitive temper, without any material conſequence. Alarmed by theſe vigorous proceedings, he immediately offered ſomething by way of excuſe for having eſpouſed this opinion; and afterwards, in the year 1334, when he lay at the point of death, though he did not entirely renounce, he, in ſome meaſure, ſoftened it, by ſaying he believed that the unembodied ſouls of the righteous *beheld the divine eſſence as far as their ſeparate ſtate and condition would permit* [q]. This declaration did not ſatisfy his adverſaries; hence his ſucceſſor BENEDICT XII, after many diſputes had been held about it, put an end to this controverſy by an unanimous reſolution of the Pariſian doctors, ordering it to be received as an article of faith, that the ſouls of the bleſſed, during their intermediate ſtate, did fully and perfectly contemplate the divine nature [r]. BENEDICT's publiſhing this reſolution could be in no way injurious to the memory of JOHN; for when the latter lay upon his death-bed, he ſubmitted his opinion to the judgment of the church, that he might not be deemed a *heretic* after his deceaſe [s].

---

[p] The particulars of this violent quarrel may be learnt from the *Records* publiſhed by Steph. Baluz. in his *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 512. *ſ.*—Edm. Martene, *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. ii. p. 641. *ſ.*—Jo. Georg. Herwart *in Ludovico Imperatore defenſo contra Bzovium, Monachii* 1618, in 4^{to}. et Christ. Gewold. *in Apologia pro Ludovico Bavaro, Ingolſtad* 1618, in 4^{to}. againſt the ſame *Bzovius*, who, in the Annals he had publiſhed, baſely aſperſed the memory of the emperor. See alſo Luc. Waddingus *in Annalib. Minor.* tom. vii. p. 77. 106, *ſ.* &c. Whoever attentively peruſes the hiſtory of this war, will perceive that Lewis of *Bavaria* followed the example of Philip the Fair, king of *France*. As Philip brought an accuſation of hereſy againſt Boniface, ſo did Lewis with reſpect to John XXII. The French monarch made uſe of Nogaret and other accuſers againſt the one pontif. Lewis employed Occam and the Franciſcans in that quality againſt the other. Each of them inſiſted upon the aſſembling a general council, and upon the depoſition of the pontifs who had incurred their diſpleaſure. I omit other circumſtances that might be alledged to render the parallel more ſtriking.

Benedict XII.

X. JOHN dying in the year 1334, new contentions aroſe in the conclave between the French and Italian cardinals about the election of a pope; but towards the end of the year they choſe JAMES FOURNIER, a Frenchman, and cardinal of *St. Priſca*, who took the name of BENEDICT XII. The writers of theſe times repreſent him as a man of great probity, who was neither chargeable with that avarice, nor that ambition that diſhonoured ſo many of his predeceſſors [t]. He put an end to the papal quarrel with the emperor LEWIS: and though he did not reſtore him to the communion of the church, becauſe prevented, as it is ſaid, by the king of *France*, yet he did not attempt any thing againſt him. He carefully attended to the grievances of the church, redreſſed them as far as was in his power, endeavoured to reform the fundamental laws of the monaſtic ſocieties, whether of the mendicant, or more opulent orders; and died in the year 1342, while he was laying the moſt noble ſchemes for promoting a yet more extenſive reformation. In ſhort, if we overlook his ſuperſtition, the prevailing blemiſh of this barbarous age, it muſt be allowed that he was a man of integrity and merit.

Clement VI.

XI. He was ſucceeded by a man of a quite different diſpoſition, CLEMENT VI, a native of *France*, whoſe name was PETER ROGER, and who was cardinal of *St. Nereus* and *St. Achilles*, before his elevation to the pontificate. Not to inſiſt upon the moſt exceptionable parts of this pontif's conduct, we ſhall only obſerve that he trod faithfully in the ſteps of John XXII, in *providing* for vacant churches and biſhoprics by *reſerving* to himſelf the diſpoſal of them, which ſhewed his ſordid and inſatiable avarice; that he conferred eccleſiaſtical dignities and benefices of the higheſt conſequence upon ſtrangers and Italians, which drew upon him the warm diſpleaſure of the kings of *England* and *France*, and laſtly, that by renewing the diſſenſions that had formerly ſubſiſted between Lewis of *Bavaria* and the Roman ſee, he diſplayed to the world his exceſſive vanity and ambition in the moſt odious colours. In the year 1343, he aſſailed the emperor with his thundering edicts, and when he heard that they were treated by that prince with the utmoſt contempt, his rage augmented, and he not only threw out new maledictions, and publiſhed new ſentences of excommunication againſt him, in the year 1346, but alſo excited the German princes to elect Henry VII, ſon to Charles IV, emperor in his place. This violent meaſure would infallibly have occaſioned a civil war in *Germany*, had it not been prevented by the death of Lewis, in the year 1347. Clement did not long ſurvive him, for he died in the year 1352, famous for nothing but his exceſſive zeal for extending the papal authority, and for his having added *Avignon*, which he purchaſed of Joan, queen of *Naples*, to the patrimony of *St. Peter*.

---

[q] See STEPH. BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 175. 177. 182. 197. 221. 786, &c. —LUC. DACHERII *Spicil. Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i. p. 760. *ed. Vet.*—JO. LAUNOII *Hiſtoria gymnaſ. Navarreni*, part. I. cap vii. p. 319. tom. iv. part. I. Opp.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom iv. p. 235. 250.—LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 371. tom. vii. p. 145.— JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 599. 608.

[r] BALUZII *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 197. 216. 221. 224. 236.

[(s) All this pope's heretical fancies about the *Beatific Viſion* were nothing in compariſon with a vile and moſt enormous *practical hereſy* that was found in his coffers after his death, *viz.* five and twenty millions of florins, of which there were eighteen in *ſpecie*, and the reſt in plate, jewels, crowns, mitres, and other precious baubles, all which he had ſqueezed out of the people and the inferior clergy during his pontificate. See FLEURY, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* livr. xciv. § 39.]

[t] See the *Fragmenta Hiſtor. Roman. in* MURATORII *Antiquit. Italic.* tom. iii. p. 275.— BALUZII *Vit. Pont. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 205. 218. 240, &c.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 253.

Innocent VI.

XII. His ſucceſſor Innocent VI, whoſe name was Stephen Albert, was much more remarkable for integrity and moderation. He was a Frenchman, and before his election had been biſhop of *Oſtia*. He died in the year 1362, after having governed the church ten years. His greateſt blemiſh was that he promoted his relations with an exceſſive partiality, but in other reſpects he was a man of merit and a great encourager of pious and learned men. He kept the monks cloſely to their duty, carefully abſtained from *reſerving churches*, and, by many good actions, acquired a great and deſerved reputation. He was ſucceeded by William Grimoard, abbot of *St. Victor* at *Marſeilles*, who took the name of Urban V, and was entirely free from all the groſſer vices, if we except thoſe which cannot eaſily be ſeparated from the papal dignity. This pope, being prevailed on by the entreaties of the Romans, returned to *Rome* in the year 1367, but, in 1370, he came back to *Avignon*, to reconcile the differences that had ariſen between the kings of *England* and *France*, and died there the ſame year.

Gregory XI.

XIII. He was ſucceeded by Peter Roger, a French eccleſiaſtic of illuſtrious deſcent, who aſſumed the name of Gregory XI, a man, who, though inferior to his predeceſſors in virtue, exceeded them far in courage and aſſurance. In his time *Italy* in general, and the city of *Rome* in particular, was diſtreſſed with moſt outrageous and fromidable tumults. The Florentines carried on ſucceſsfully a terrible war againſt the eccleſiaſtical ſtate [u]. Upon which, Gregory, in hopes of quieting the diſorders of

---

[u] See, chiefly, Colucii Salutati *Epiſtolæ*, written in the name of the Florentines, part. I. p. 47—100. p. 148. 162. See alſo *Præfat.* ad part. II. p. xviii. the new Florentine edition by Laur. Mehus.

Italy, and alſo of recovering the cities and territories which had been taken from *St. Peter's patrimony*, transferred the papal ſeat from *Avignon* to *Rome*, in the year 1376. To this he was in a great meaſure determined by the advice of one CATHERINE, a virgin of SENS, who, in this credulous age, was thought to be inſpired with a ſpirit of prophecy, and made a journey to *Avignon* on purpoſe to perſuade him to take this ſtep [*w*]. It was not, however, long before GREGORY repented that he had followed her advice: for by the long abſence of the popes from *Italy*, their authority was reduced to ſuch a low ebb, that the Romans and Florentines made no ſcruple to inſult him with the groſſeſt abuſe, which made him reſolve to return to *Avignon*; but before he could execute his determination he was taken off by death, in the year 1378.

A great ſchiſm ariſes in the Romiſh church.

XIV. After the death of GREGORY XI, the cardinals aſſembled to conſult about chooſing a ſucceſſor, when the people of *Rome*, fearing leſt the vacant dignity ſhould be conferred on a Frenchman, came in a tumultuous manner to the conclave, and with great clamours, accompanied with many outrageous threatenings, inſiſted that an Italian ſhould be advanced to the popedom. The cardinals terrified by this uproar immediately proclaimed BARTHOLOMEW DE PREGNANO, who was a Neapolitan, and archbiſhop of *Bari*, and aſſumed the name of URBAN VI. This new pontif, by his unpolite behaviour, injudicious ſeverity, and intolerable arrogance, had made himſelf many enemies among people of all ranks, and eſpecially among the leading cardinals. Theſe latter therefore tired of his inſolence, withdrew from *Rome* to *Anagni*, and from thence to *Fondi*, a city in the kingdom of *Naples*, where they elected to the pontificate ROBERT count of *Geneva*, who took the name of CLEMENT VII, and declared at the ſame time that the election of URBAN was nothing more than a mere ceremony, which they had found themſelves obliged to perform in order to calm the turbulent rage of the populace. Which of theſe two is to be conſidered as the true and lawful pope, is, to this day, matter of doubt, nor will the *records* and writings, alledged by the contending parties, enable us to adjuſt that point with any certainty [*x*]. URBAN remained at *Rome*: CLEMENT went to *Avignon* in *France*. His cauſe was eſpouſed by *France* and *Spain*, *Scotland*, *Sicily*, and *Cyprus*, while all the reſt of *Europe* acknowledged URBAN to be the true vicar of CHRIST.

Its bad conſequences.

XV. Thus the union of the Latin church under one head was deſtroyed at the death of GREGORY XI, and was ſucceeded by that deplorable diſſenſion, commonly known by the name of the *great weſtern ſchiſm* [*y*]. This diſſenſion was fomented with ſuch dreadful ſucceſs, and aroſe to ſuch a ſhameful height, that, for the ſpace of fifty years, the church had two or three different heads at the ſame time; each of the contending popes forming plots, and thundering out anathemas againſt their competitors. The diſtreſs and calamity of theſe times is beyond all power of deſcription: for, not to inſiſt upon the perpetual contentions and wars between the factions of the ſeveral popes, by which multitudes loſt their fortunes and lives, all ſenſe of religion was extinguiſhed in moſt places and profligacy roſe to a moſt ſcandalous exceſs. The clergy, while they vehemently contended which of the reigning popes was the true ſucceſſor of CHRIST, were ſo exceſſively corrupt, as to be no longer ſtudious to keep up even an appearance of religion or decency: and in conſequence of all this, many plain well-meaning people, who concluded that no one could poſſibly partake of eternal life, unleſs united with the vicar of CHRIST, were overwhelmed with doubt, and plunged into the deepeſt diſtreſs of mind [z]. Nevertheleſs theſe abuſes were, by their conſequences, greatly conducive both to the civil and religious intereſts of mankind; for by theſe diſſenſions the papal power received an incurable wound; and kings and princes, who had formerly been the ſlaves of the lordly pontifs, now became their judges and maſters. And many of the leaſt ſtupid among the people had the courage to diſregard and deſpiſe the popes on account of their odious diſputes about dominion, to commit their ſalvation to God alone, and to admit it as a maxim, that the proſperity of the church might be maintained and the intereſts of religion ſecured and promoted without a viſible head, crowned with a ſpiritual ſupremacy.

[*w*] See LONGUEVAL *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xiv. p. 159. 192.

[*x*] See the acts and documents in CÆS. EGASS. DE BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 463. *ſ.*—LUC. WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. ix. p. 12. *ſ.*—STEPH. BALUZII *Vit. Pontiſ. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 442. 998. *ſ.* *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *April*, p. 728. I have alſo ſome documents never yet publiſhed, which throw great light upon this controverſy, though they do not abſolutely determine the point in diſpute.

[*y*] An account of this diſſenſion may be ſeen in PIERRE DU PUY *Hiſtoire Generale du Schiſme qui a eté en l'Egliſe depuis l'An* 1378, *juſqu' en l'An* 1428. which, as we are informed in the *Preface*, was compiled from the Royal Records of *France*, and entirely worthy of credit. Nor ſhould we

Propoſals for aboliſhing the ſchiſm.

XVI. The Italian cardinals attached to the intereſts of URBAN VI, upon the death of that pope in the year 1389, ſet up for his ſucceſſor, at *Rome*, PETER THOMACELLI, a Neapolitan, who took the name of BONIFACE IX, and CLEMENT VII, dying in the year 1394, the French cardinals raiſed to the pontificate PETER DE LUNA, a Spaniard, who aſſumed the name of BENEDICT XIII. During theſe tranſactions various methods were propoſed and attempted for healing this melancholy breach in the church. Kings and princes, biſhops and divines, appeared with zeal in this ſalutary project. It was generally thought that the beſt courſe to be taken in this matter was, what they then ſtyled, the *Method of ceſſion*: but neither of the popes could be prevailed on, either by intreaties or threatenings, to give up the pontificate. The Gallican church, highly incenſed at this obſtinacy, renounced ſolemnly, in a council held at *Paris* in the year 1397, all ſubjection and obedience to both pontifs; and upon the publication of this reſolution

---

wholly reject LEWIS MAIMBOURG's *Hiſtoire du grand Schiſme d'Occident*, though in general it is deeply tainted with the leaven of party ſpirit. A great many documents are to be met with in BOULAY *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. and v. and alſo in EDM. MARTENE *Theſauri Anecdotor.* tom. ii. p. 1074. I always paſs over the common writers upon this ſubject, ſuch as ALEXANDER, RAYNALD, BZOVIUS, SPONDANUS, and DU PIN.

[z] Concerning the miſchievous conſequences of this ſchiſm, we have a large account in the *Hiſtoire du droit public Eccleſ. François*, tom. ii. p. 166. 193. 202. *ſ.*

in the year 1398, BENEDICT XIII was, by the expreſs orders of CHARLES VI, detained priſoner in his palace at *Avignon* [a].

The enormities of the monks, eſpecially of the Mendicants.

XVII. Some of the popes, and eſpecially BENEDICT XII, were perfectly acquainted with the prevailing vices, and ſcandalous conduct of the greateſt part of the monks, which they zealouſly endeavoured to rectify and remove: but the diſorder was too inveterate to admit of a cure. The *Mendicants*, and more eſpecially the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans*, were at the head of the monaſtic orders, and were, indeed, become the heads of the church; ſo extenſive was the influence they had acquired, that all matters of importance, both in the court of *Rome* and in the cabinets of princes, were carried on under their ſupreme and abſolute direction. The multitude had ſuch a high notion of the ſanctity of theſe *ſturdy beggars*, and of their credit with the ſupreme Being, that great numbers of both ſexes, ſome in health, others in a ſtate of infirmity, others at the point of death, earneſtly deſired to be admitted into the *Mendicant* order, which they looked upon as a ſure and infallible method of rendering heaven propitious. Many made it an eſſential part of their laſt wills, that their carcaſes, after death, ſhould be wrapped in old, ragged Dominican or Franciſcan habits, and interred among the Mendicants. For ſuch was the barbarous ſuperſtition, and wretched ignorance of this age, that people univerſally believed they ſhould readily obtain mercy from CHRIST, at the day of judgment, if they appeared before his tribunal aſſociated with the Mendicant friars.

They fall under a general odium.

XVIII. The high eſteem in which the Mendicant orders were held, and the exceſſive degree of authority they had acquired, only ſerved to render them ſtill more odious to ſuch as had hitherto been their enemies, and to draw upon them new marks of jealouſy and hatred from the higher and lower clergy, the monaſtic ſocieties and the public univerſities. So univerſal was this odium, that there was ſcarcely a province or univerſity in *Europe* in which the biſhops, clergy, and doctors were not warmly engaged in oppoſition to the Dominicans and Franciſcans, who employed the power and authority they had received from the popes, in undermining the antient diſcipline of the church, and aſſuming to themſelves a certain ſuperintendence in religious matters. In *England* the univerſity of *Oxford* made a reſolute ſtand againſt the encroachments of the Dominicans [b], while RICHARD, archbiſhop of *Armagh*, HENRY CRUMP, NORIS, and others, attacked all the Mendicant orders with great vehemence and ſeverity [c]. But RICHARD, whoſe animoſity againſt them was much keener than that of their other antagoniſts, went to the court of INNOCENT VI, in the year 1356, and there vindicated the cauſe of the church againſt them with prodigious fervor, both in his writings and diſcourſe, until the year 1360, in which he died [*d*]. They had alſo many opponents in *France*, who, together with the univerſity of *Paris*, were ſecretly engaged in contriving means to overturn their exorbitant power [*d*]: but JOHN DE POLLIAC ſet himſelf openly againſt them, publicly denying the validity of the abſolution granted by the Dominicans and Franciſcans to thoſe who confeſſed to them, maintaining, that the popes were diſabled from granting them a power of abſolution, by the authority of the *canon*, entitled, *Omnis utriuſque ſexus*; and proving from theſe premiſes, that all thoſe, who would be ſure of their ſalvation, ought to confeſs their ſins to their own pariſh prieſts, even though they had been abſolved by the monks. They ſuffered little or nothing, however, from the efforts of theſe numerous adverſaries, being reſolutely protected againſt all oppoſition, whether open or ſecret, by the popes, who regarded them as their beſt friends, and moſt effectual ſupports. Accordingly, JOHN XXII, by an extraordinary decree, condemned the opinions of JOHN DE POLLIAC, in the year 1321 [*e*].

---

[a] Beſides the common hiſtorians, and LONGUEVAL's *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xiv. ſee the *Acts* of this council in BOULAY's *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 829.

[b] See ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 150. 154. 196, &c.

[c] See WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 181, 182. tom. ii. p. 61, 62.—BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 338. 950.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 336.—WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. viii. p. 126.

John Wickliff.

XIX. But among all the enemies of the Mendicant orders, none has been tranſmitted to poſterity with more exalted encomiums on the one hand, or blacker calumnies on the other, than JOHN WICKLIFF, an Engliſh doctor, profeſſor of divinity at *Oxford*, and afterwards rector of *Lutterworth*; who, according to the teſtimony of the writers of theſe times, was a man of an enterpriſing genius, and extraordinary learning. In the year 1360, animated by the example of RICHARD, archbiſhop of *Armagh*, he firſt of all defended the ſtatutes and privileges of the univerſity of *Oxford* againſt all the orders of the Mendicants, and had the courage to throw out ſome ſlight reproofs againſt the popes, their principal patrons, which no true Briton ever imputed to him as a crime. After this, in the year 1367, he was deprived of the wardenſhip of *Canterbury-Hall* in the univerſity of *Oxford*, by SIMON LANGHAM, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, who ſubſtituted a monk in his place; upon which he appealed to pope URBAN V, who confirmed the ſentence of the archbiſhop againſt him, on account of the freedom with which he had inveighed againſt the monaſtic orders. Highly exaſperated at this treatment he threw off all reſtraint, and not only attacked all the monks, and their ſcandalous irregularities, but even the pontifical power itſelf, and other eccleſiaſtical abuſes, both in his ſermons and writings. From hence he proceeded to yet greater lengths, and deteſting the wretched ſuperſtition of the times, refuted, with great acuteneſs and ſpirit, the abſurd notions that were generally received in religious matters, and not only exhorted the laity to ſtudy the ſcriptures, but alſo tranſlated into Engliſh theſe divine books, in order to render the peruſal of them more univerſal.

[*d*] See SIMON *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. i. p. 164.—I have in my poſſeſſion a manuſcript treatiſe of BARTHOLEMEW DE BRISAC, entitled, *Solutiones oppoſitæ Ricardi, Armachani epiſcopi, propoſitionibus contra Mendicantes in curia Romana coram Pontifice et cardinalibus factis, Anno* 1360.

[*e*] See JO. LAUNOIUS, *De Canone: Omnis utriuſque Sexus*, tom. i. part. i. Opp. p. 271. 274. 287, &c.—BALUZII *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 10. & *Miſcellaneor.* tom. i. p. 153.—DACHERII *Spicil. Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i. p. 112. ſ.—It was publiſhed by EDM. MARTENE *in Theſauro-Anecdotor.* tom. i. p. 1368. See alſo BALUZII *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 132. 182, &c.

Though neither the doctrine of WICKLIFF was void of error, nor his life without reproach, yet it muſt be confeſſed that the changes he attempted to introduce, both in the faith and diſcipline of the church, were, in many reſpects, wiſe, uſeful, and ſalutary [f].

His adverſaries.

XX. The monks, whom WICKLIFF had principally exaſperated, commenced a violent proſecution againſt him at the court of GREGORY XI, who, in the year 1377, ordered SIMON SUDBURY, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, to take cognizance of the affair in a council held at *London*. Imminent as this danger evidently was, WICKLIFF eſcaped it by the intereſt of the duke of *Lancaſter*, and ſome other peers, who had an high regard for him. And ſoon after the death of GREGORY XI, the fatal ſchiſm of the Romiſh church commenced, during which there was one pope at *Rome*, and another at *Avignon*; ſo that of courſe this controverſy lay dormant a long time. But no ſooner was this embroiled ſtate of affairs tolerably ſettled, than the proceſs againſt him was revived by WILLIAM DE COURTENAY, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, in the year 1385, and was carried on with great vehemence, in two councils held at *London* and *Oxford*. The event was, that of the *twenty-three* opinions, for which WICKLIFF had been proſecuted by the monks, ten were condemned as heretics, and *thirteen* as errors [g]. He himſelf, however, returned in ſafety to *Lutterworth*, where he died peaceably, in the year 1387. This latter attack was much more dangerous than the former; but by what means he got ſafely through it, whether by the intereſt of the court, or by denying, or abjuring his opinions, is to this day a ſecret [h]. He left many followers in *England*, and other countries, who were ſtyled *Wickliffites* and *Lollards*, which laſt was a term of popular reproach tranſlated from the Flemiſh tongue into Engliſh. Wherever they could be found, they were terribly perſecuted by the *inquiſitors*, and other inſtruments of papal vengeance, and, in the council of *Conſtance*, in the year 1415, the memory and opinions of Wickliff were condemned by a ſolemn decree: and about thirteen years after, his bones were dug up, and publicly burnt.

---

[f] A work of his was publiſhed at *Leipſic* and *Francfort* in 4to. in the year 1753, entitled, *Dialogorum Libri quatuor*, which, though it does not contain all the branches of his doctrine, yet ſhews ſufficiently the ſpirit of the man, and his way of thinking in general.

[(g) In the original Dr. MOSHEIM ſays, that, of eighteen articles imputed to WICKLIFF, nine were condemned as *hereſies*, and fifteen as *errors*. This contradiction, which we have taken the liberty to correct in the text, is perhaps an overſight of the learned author, who may have confounded the eighteen hereſies and errors that were enumerated and refuted by WILLIAM WODFORD in a letter to ARUNDEL, archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, with the twenty-three propoſitions that had been condemned by his predeceſſor COURTNEY at *London*, of which ten were pronounced *heretical*, and thirteen *erroneous*. See the very curious collection of pieces, entitled, *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum* ORTHUINI GRATII, publiſhed firſt at *Cologn*, by the compiler, in the year 1535, and afterwards at *London* in 1690, with an additional volume of ancient pieces and fragments by the learned Mr. EDWARD BROWN. The letter of WODFORD is at full length in the firſt volume of this collection, p. 191.]

[h] We have a full and complete *Hiſtory of the Life and Sufferings of John Wickliff*, publiſhed in 8vo at *London* in the year 1720, by Mr. JOHN LEWIS, who alſo publiſhed, in the year 1731, WICKLIFF's Engliſh tranſlation of the *New Teſtament* from the Latin verſion, called the *Vulgate*. This tranſlation is enriched with a learned *Preface* by the editor, in which he enlarges upon the life, actions, and ſufferings of that eminent reformer. The pieces, relative to the controverſies which were ſet on foot by the doctrines of WICKLIFF, are to be found in the learned work of WILKINS, entitled, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hibern.* tom. iii. p. 116. 156.—See alſo BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 450.—ANT. WOOD. *Antiqq. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 183. 186, & paſſim.

The impiety of the Franciſcans.

XXI. Notwithſtanding the Mendicants were thus vigorouſly attacked on all ſides, by ſuch a conſiderable number of ingenious and learned adverſaries, they could not be perſuaded to abate any thing of their exceſſive pride, to ſet bounds to their ſuperſtition, or to deſiſt from impoſing upon the multitude, but were as diligent as ever in propagating opinions highly detrimental to religion in general, and particularly injurious to the majeſty of the ſupreme Being. The Franciſcans forgetting, in their enthuſiaſtic frenzy, the veneration that they owed to the Son of God, and animated with a mad zeal for advancing the glory of their order and its founder, impiouſly maintained, that the latter was a *ſecond* Christ, in all reſpects ſimilar to the *firſt*; and that their inſtitution and diſcipline was the true goſpel of Jesus. Yet ſhocking as theſe fooliſh and impious pretenſions were, the popes were not aſhamed to patronize and encourage them by their letters and mandates, in which they made no ſcruple to aſſert that the abſurd fable of the *ſtigmas*, or five wounds impreſſed upon Francis by Christ himſelf, on mount *Alvernus*, was worthy of credit, becauſe matter of undoubted fact [i]. Nor was this all; for they not only permitted to be publiſhed without any mark of their diſapprobation, but approved, and even recommended, an impious piece ſtuffed with tales yet more improbable and ridiculous than either of the abovementioned fictions, and entitled, *The Book of the conformities of St. Francis with* Jesus Christ, which was compoſed, in the year 1383, by Bartholomew Albizi, a Franciſcan of *Piſa*, with the applauſe of his order. This infamous tract, in which the Son of God is put upon a level with a wretched miſerable mortal, is an eternal

The Book of the conformities of St. Francis.

---

[i] The ſtory of the *marks*, or *ſtigmas*, impreſſed on Francis is well known, as are alſo the letters of the Roman pontifs, which enjoin the belief of it, and which Wadding has collected with great care and publiſhed in his *Annales Minorum*, tom. viii. & ix. The Dominicans formerly made a public jeſt of this ridiculous fable, but, being awed into ſilence by the papal bulls, they are now obliged to deride it in ſecret, while the Franciſcans, on the other hand, continue to propagate it with the moſt fervent zeal. That St. Francis had upon his body the *marks* or impreſſions of the five great wounds of Christ, is not to be doubted, ſince this is a fact proved by a great number of unexceptionable witneſſes. But as he was a moſt ſuperſtitious and fanatical mortal, it is undoubtedly evident, that he *imprinted* on himſelf theſe *holy* wounds, that he might reſemble Christ, and bear about in his body a perpetual memorial of the Redeemer's ſufferings. It was cuſtomary in theſe times, for ſuch as were willing to be thought more pious than others, to imprint upon their bodies *marks* of this kind, that having thus continually before them a lively repreſentation of the death of Christ, they might preſerve a becoming ſenſe of it on their minds. The words of St. Paul, *Galat*. vi. 17. were ſufficient to confirm, in this wretched deluſion, an ignorant and ſuperſtitious age in which the ſcriptures were neither ſtudied nor underſtood. A long liſt of theſe *ſtigmatiſed fanatics* might be extracted from the *Acta Sanctorum*, and other records of this and the following century; nor is this ancient piece of ſuperſtition entirely aboliſhed, even in our times. Be that as it may, the Franciſcan monks having found theſe *marks* upon the dead body of their founder, took this occaſion of making him appear to the world as honoured by heaven above the reſt of mortals, and invented, for this purpoſe, the ſtory of Christ's having miraculouſly transferred his wounds to him.

monument of the outrageous enthuſiaſm, and abominable arrogance of the Franciſcan order; and not leſs ſo of the exceſſive imprudence of the popes in extolling and recommending it [*k*].

The enormities of the Fratricelli.

XXII. The Franciſcans, who adhered to the genuine and auſtere rule of their founder, and oppoſed the popes, who attempted to mitigate the ſeverity of its injunctions, were not a whit wiſer than thoſe of the order, who acknowledged the juriſdiction and reſpected the deciſions of the Roman pontifs. By theſe antipapal Franciſcans, I mean the *Fratricelli* or Minorites, and the Tertiaries of that order, otherwiſe called *Beghards*, together with the *Spirituals*, who reſided principally in *France*, and embraced the opinions of PIERRE D'OLIVE. Theſe monaſtic factions were turbulent and ſeditious beyond expreſſion; they gave incredible vexation to the popes, and for a long time diſturbed, wherever they went, the tranquillity both of church and ſtate. About the beginning of this century [*l*], the leſs auſtere Franciſcans were outrageous in their reſentment againſt the *Fratricelli*, who had deſerted their communion [*m*]; upon which ſuch of the latter, as had the good fortune to eſcape the fury of their perſecutors, retired into *France* in the year 1307, and aſſociated themſelves with the *Spirituals* or followers of PIERRE D'OLIVE in *Provence*, who had alſo formerly abandoned the ſociety. Soon after this the whole Franciſcan order in *France*, *Italy*, and other countries was divided into two parties. The one, which embraced the ſevere diſcipline and abſolute poverty of St. FRANCIS, were called *Spirituals*; the other, which inſiſted upon mitigating the auſtere injunctions of their founder, were ſtyled the *Brethren of the community*. The latter, being by far the moſt numerous and powerful, exerted themſelves to the utmoſt to oppreſs the former, whoſe faction as yet was but weak, and, as it were, in its infancy; but notwithſtanding this, they chearfully ſubmitted to theſe hardſhips, rather than return to the ſociety of thoſe who had deſerted the rules of their maſter. Pope CLEMENT V having drawn the leaders of theſe two parties to his court, took great pains to compoſe their diſſenſions; nevertheleſs, his pacific ſcheme advanced but ſlowly, on account of the inflexible obſtinacy of each ſect, and the great number of their mutual accuſations. In the mean while the *Spirituals* of *Tuſcany*, inſtead of waiting for the deciſion of his holineſs, choſe themſelves a preſident, and inferior officers, while thoſe of *France*, being in the neighbourhood of *Avignon*, patiently expected the papal determination [n].

[*k*] Concerning ALBIZI and his book, ſee WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. ix. p. 158.—J. A. FABRICII *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 131.—SCHELHORNII *Amæn. Litter.* tom. iii. p. 160.—BAYLE'S *Dictionary*, at the article FRANCIS, and the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hiſt. Crit.* tom. i. at the article ALBIZI, p. 217. ERASMUS ALBERT made ſeveral extracts from this book, and publiſhed them under the title of the *Alcoran of the Franciſcans*, which was frequently printed in Latin, German, and French; and in the year 1734, was publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in two volumes 8vo. in French and in Latin, with elegant cuts.

[The *Conformities* between CHRIST and St. FRANCIS are carried to forty in the book of ALBIZI, but they are multiplied to 4000 by a Spaniſh monk of the Order of obſervants, in a book publiſhed at *Madrid* in the year 1651, under the following title, *Prodigioſum Naturæ et Gratiæ Portentum*. The *Conformities* mentioned by PEDRO DE ALVA ASTORGA, the auſtere author of this moſt ridiculous book, are whimſical beyond expreſſion. See the *Bibliotheque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, tom. iv. p. 318.]

[*l*] In the years 1306 and 1307.

[*m*] WADDINGI *Annales Minor.* tom. vi. *ad An.* 1307. p. 91.

Deliberations about compoſing the differences among the Franciſcans.

XXIII. After many deliberations, CLEMENT V, in a general council held at *Vienne*, in *Dauphine*, where he iſſued out the famous bull, *Exivi de paradiſo* [o], propoſed an expedient for healing the breach between the jarring parties, by wiſe conceſſions on both ſides. He gave up many points to the *Spirituals*, or rigid Franciſcans, enjoining upon the whole order the profeſſion of *abſolute poverty*, according to their primitive rule, and the ſolemn *renunciation of all property, whether common or perſonal*, confining them to what was neceſſary for their *immediate ſubſiſtence*, and allowing them even for that a very *ſcanty pittance*. He, however, on the other hand, permitted the Franciſcans, who lived in places where it was extremely difficult to procure by begging the neceſſities of life, to erect *granaries* and *ſtore-houſes*, where they might depoſite a part of their alms as a *ſtock* in caſe of want; and ordered that all ſuch *granaries and ſtore-houſes* ſhould be under the inſpection and management of inſpectors and ſtore-keepers who were to determine what quantity of proviſions ſhould be laid up in them. And finally, in order to ſatisfy the *Brethren of the community*, he condemned ſome opinions of PIERRE D'OLIVE [p]. Theſe proceedings ſilenced the monaſtic commotions in *France*; but the Tuſcan and Italian *Spirituals* were ſo exceeding perverſe and obſtinate, that they could not be brought to conſent to any method of reconciliation. At length, in the year 1313, many of them, not thinking themſelves any longer ſafe in *Italy*, went into *Sicily*, where they met with a very friendly reception from king FREDERIC, the nobility and biſhops [q].

XXIV. Upon the death of CLEMENT V, the tumult, which had been appeaſed by his authority, was revived in *France* with as much fury as ever. For, in the year 1314, an hundred and twenty of the *Spirituals* made a violent attack upon the *Brethren of the community*, drove them out of the convents of *Narbonne* and *Beziers* by force of arms, and inflamed the quarrel in a yet higher degree by laying aſide their antient habits, and aſſuming ſuch as were ſhort, ſtrait, and coarſe. They were ſoon joined by a conſiderable number from other provinces; and the citizens of *Narbonne*, where OLIVE was interred, enliſted themſelves in the party. JOHN XXII, who was raiſed to the pontificate in the year 1317, took great pains to heal this new diſorder. The firſt thing he did for this purpoſe was to publiſh a ſpecial bull, by which he ordered the abolition of the *Fratricelli*, or *Minorites*, and their *Tertiaries*, whether *Beguines*, or *Begbards*, who were a body diſtinct from the

---

[n] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. iv. 1310, p. 172.—ECCARDI *Corpus Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1480.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 129.—ECHARDI *Scriptor. Præcdiator.* tom. i. p. 508, 509.

[o] This bull is inſerted in the *Jus Canonicum inter Clementinas*, tit. xi. *De verbor. ſignif.* tom. ii. p. 1095. ed. *Bëhmeri.*

[p] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vi. p. 194. 197. 199.

[q] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vi. p. 213. 214.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 152. 165.—ARGENTRE, *Collectio judicior. de novis error.* tom. i. p. 392. ſ.

Spirituals [r]. In the next place he admoniſhed the king of *Sicily* to expel all the *Spirituals* who had taken refuge in his dominions [s]: and then ordered the French *Spirituals* to appear at *Avignon*, where he exhorted them to return to their duty; and, as the firſt ſtep to it, to lay aſide *their ſhort, ſtrait habits with the ſmall hoods.* The greateſt part of them obeyed, but FR. BERNARD DELITIOSI, who was the head of the faction, and twenty four of the Brethren, boldly refuſed to ſubmit to the injunction. In vindication of their conduct, they alledged that the rules preſcribed by St. FRANCIS were the ſame with the goſpel of JESUS CHRIST; that the popes therefore had no authority to alter them; that the popes had acted ſinfully in permitting the Franciſcans to have *granaries and ſtore-houſes*; and that they added to their guilt in not allowing thoſe habits to be worn that were enjoyned by St. FRANCIS. JOHN, highly exaſperated by this oppoſition, gave orders that theſe obſtinate Brethren ſhould be proceeded againſt as *heretics.* And ſurely they deſerved to be ranked among the *vileſt heretics*, for daring thus audaciouſly to oppoſe the authority and majeſty of the Roman ſee. As for F. DELITIOSI, who was at the head of this ſect, and who is ſometimes called DELLI CONSI, he was impriſoned, and died in his confinement. Four of his adherents were condemned to the flames, in the year 1318, at *Marſeilles* [t], which odious ſentence was accordingly executed without mercy.

The ridiculous diſputes of the Franciſcans.

XXV. Thus theſe unhappy friars, and many more of their fraternity who were afterwards cut off by this cruel perſecution, ſuffered merely for their contempt of the deciſions of the pontifs, and for maintaining that the inſtitute of St. FRANCIS, their founder, which they imagined he had eſtabliſhed under the direction of an immediate inſpiration, was the very *Goſpel of Chriſt*, and therefore not to be altered by the pope's authority. The controverſy, conſidered in itſelf, was rather ridiculous than important, ſince it did not affect religion in the leaſt, but turned wholly on theſe two points, the form of the habits to be worn by the Franciſcan order, and their *granaries* and *ſtore-houſes*. The *Brethren of the community*, or the leſs rigid Franciſcans, wore long, looſe, and good habits, with ample hoods; but the *Spirituals* went in ſtrait, ſhort, and very coarſe ones, which they aſſerted to be preciſely the dreſs enjoined by the inſtitute of St. FRANCIS, and what therefore no power upon earth had a right to alter. And whereas the *Brethren of the community*, immediately after the harveſt and vintage, were accuſtomed to lay up a ſtock of corn and wine in their granaries and cellars, the *Spiritual* Franciſcans reſolutely oppoſed this practice as entirely repugnant to the profeſſion of abſolute poverty that had been embraced by the *Fratricelli* or *Minorites*. In order to put an end to theſe broils, pope John, this very year, publiſhed a long mandatory letter, in which he ordered the contending parties to ſubmit their diſputes upon the two points abovementioned, to the deciſion of their ſuperiors [u].

---

[r] This law is called *Sancta Romana*, &c. and is to be found among the *Extravagantes Johannis* XXII. tit. vii. *De religioſis domibus*, tom. ii. *Jur. Canon.* p. 1112.

[s] WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 265. *ſ.*

[t] BALUZII *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 116. tom. ii. p. 341. et *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 195. 272. WADDINGUS *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 267. *ſ.* 316. *ſ.* MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. v. p. 175. MARTINUS *Fuldenſis*, in ECCARDI *Corpore Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1725. et HERM. CÖRNERUS, *ibid.* tom. ii. p. 981. *Hiſtoire generale de Languedoc*, tom. iv. p. 179. *ſ.* ARGENTRE *Collectio Judicior. de novis errorib.* tom. i. p. 294. *ſ.*

Excite grievous commotions.

XXVI. The effects of this letter, and of other decrees, were prevented by the unſeaſonable and impious ſeverity of John XXII, whoſe cruelty was condemned and deteſted even by his adherents. For the *Spiritual* Franciſcans and their votaries, being highly exaſperated at the cruel death of their brethren, maintained, that John XXII, by procuring the deſtruction of theſe holy men, had rendered himſelf utterly unworthy of the papal dignity, and was the true *Antichriſt*. They moreover revered their four brethren who were burnt at *Marſeilles*, as ſo many martyrs, paying religious veneration to their bones and aſhes, and inveighed yet more vehemently than ever againſt *long habits*, *large hoods*, *granaries*, and *ſtore-houſes*. The inquiſitors, on the other hand, having, by the pope's order, apprehended as many of theſe people as they could find, condemned them to the flames, and ſacrificed them without mercy to papal reſentment and fury. So that from this time a vaſt number of thoſe zealous defenders of the inſtitute of St. Francis, *viz.* the *Minorites*, *Beggards*, and *Spirituals*, were moſt barbarouſly put to death, not only in *France*, but alſo in *Italy*, *Spain*, and *Germany* [w].

A new diſpute ariſes concerning the poverty of Chriſt.

XXVII. This dreadful flame continued to ſpread, till it invaded the whole Franciſcan order, which, in the year 1321, had received the old contentions concerning the poverty of Christ and his apoſtles. A certain *Beguin*, or monk of the third order of St. Francis, who was apprehended this year at *Narbonne*, taught, among other things, *That neither Chriſt, nor his apoſtles, ever poſſeſſed any thing, whether in common or perſonally, by right of property or dominion.* John de Belna, an inquiſitor of the Dominican order, pronounced this opinion erroneous; but Berengarius Taloni, a Franciſcan, maintained it to be orthodox, and perfectly conſonant to the bull, *Exiit qui ſeminet*, of Nicholas III. The judgment of the former was approved by the Dominicans; the determination of the latter was adhered to by the Franciſcans. At length the matter was brought before the pope, who prudently endeavoured to put an end to the diſpute. With this view he called into his council Ubertinus de Casalis, the patron of the *Spiritual*, and a perſon of great weight and reputation. This eminent monk gave captious, ſubtile, and equivocal anſwers to the queſtions that were propoſed to him. The pontif, however, and the cardinals, perſuaded that his deciſions, equivocal as they were, might contribute to terminate the quarrel, acquieſced in them, ſeconded them with their authority, and enjoined, at the ſame time, ſilence and moderation on the contending parties [x].

---

[u] It may be ſeen in the *Jus Canon.* inter *Extravag. communes de verbor. ſignif.* cap. i. See alſo Waddingi *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 273.

[w] Beſides many other pieces that ſerve to illuſtrate the intricate hiſtory of this perſecution, I have in my poſſeſſion a treatiſe, entitled, *Martyrologium Spiritualium et Fratricellorum*, which was delivered to the tribunal of the inquiſition at *Carcaſſone*, A. D. 1454. It contains the names of an hundred and thirteen perſons of both ſexes, who, from the year 1318 to the time of Innocent VI, were burnt in *France* and *Italy*, for their inflexible attachment to the poverty of St. Francis. I reckon that from theſe and other records, publiſhed and unpubliſhed, we may make out a liſt of two thouſand martyrs of this kind. Compare *Codex Inquiſ. Toloſanæ*, à Limborchio editus, p. 298. 302. 319. 327, &c.

XXVIII. But the Dominicans and Franciſcans were ſo exceedingly exaſperated againſt each other, that they could by no means be brought to conform themſelves to this order. JOHN XXII perceiving this, permitted them to renew the controverſy in the year 1322; nay, he himſelf, propoſed to ſome of the moſt celebrated divines of the age, and eſpecially to thoſe of *Paris*, the determination of this point, *viz. Whether or no thoſe were to be deemed heretics who maintained that Jeſus Chriſt, and his apoſtles, had no common or perſonal property in any thing they poſſeſſed?* The Franciſcans, who held an aſſembly this year at *Perugia*, having got notice of this proceeding, unanimouſly decreed, that thoſe who held this tenet were not heretics, but maintained an opinion that was holy and othodox, and perfectly agreeable to the deciſions and mandates of the popes. They alſo ſent a deputy to *Avignon* to defend this unanimous determination of their whole order againſt all opponents whatever. The perſon they commiſſioned for this purpoſe was F. BONAGRATIA, of *Bergamo*, who alſo went by the name of BONCORTESE [y], one of their fraternity, and a man famous for his extenſive learning. JOHN XXII being highly incenſed at this ſtep, iſſued out a decree in the month of November, wherein he eſpouſed an opinion diametrically oppoſite to that of the Franciſcans, and pronounced them heretics, for obſtinately maintaining *that Chriſt, and his apoſtles, had no common or perſonal property in what they poſſeſſed, nor a power of ſelling, or alienating, any part of it.* Soon after he proceeded yet farther, and in another conſtitution publiſhed in December following, expoſed the weakneſs and inefficacy of thoſe arguments, commonly deduced from a bull of NICHOLAS III, concerning the property of the Franciſcan poſſeſſions being transferred to the church of *Rome*, whereby the monks were ſuppoſed to be deprived of what we call *right*, and were only allowed the *ſimple uſe* of what was neceſſary for their *immediate* ſupport. In order to confute this plea, he ſhewed that it was abſolutely impoſſible to ſeparate *right* and *property*, from the *lawful uſe* of ſuch things as were immediately conſumed by that uſe. He alſo ſolemnly renounced all property in the Franciſcan effects, which had been reſerved to the church of *Rome* by former popes, their churches and ſome other things excepted. And whereas the revenues of the order had been hitherto received and adminiſtred by procurators on the part of the Roman church, he diſmiſſed theſe officers, and aboliſhed all the decrees of his predeceſſors, and all the antient conſtitutions relating to this affair [z].

---

[x] WADDINGI *Annal. Minor*, tom. vi. p. 361. STEPH. BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 307. GERH. DU BOIS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ.* p. 611. *ſ.*

[y] I inſert this caution, becauſe I have obſerved that ſome eminent writers, by not attending to this circumſtance, have taken theſe two names for two different perſons.

[z] Theſe conſtitutions are recorded in the *Corpus Juris Canon.* and alſo among the *Extravagantes*, tit. xiv. *de verbor. ſignific.* cap. ii, iii. p. 1121. Concerning the tranſaction itſelf, the

XXIX. By

The quarrel between the Franciſcans and John XXII.

XXIX. By this method of proceeding the dexterous pontif entirely deſtroyed that boaſted *expropriation*, which was the main bulwark of the Franciſcan order, and which its founder had eſteemed the diſtinguiſhing glory of the ſociety. It was therefore natural that theſe meaſures ſhould determine the Franciſcans to an obſtinate reſiſtance. And ſuch indeed was the effect they produced, for, in the year 1323, they ſent their brother BONAGRATIA in quality of legate to the papal court, where he vigorouſly and openly oppoſed the latter conſtitution of JOHN, boldly affirming, that it was contrary to all law both human or divine [a]. The pope, on the other hand, highly exaſperated againſt this audacious defender of the Franciſcan poverty, threw him into priſon; and by a new edict, which he publiſhed about the end of the year, enacted that all who maintained that CHRIST, and his apoſtles, had no common nor ſpecial property in any of their poſſeſſions ſhould be deemed heretics, and corruptors of the true religion [b]. Finding, however, that the Franciſcans were not terrified in the leaſt by this decree, he publiſhed another yet more flaming conſtitution about the end of the year 1324, in which he confirmed his former edicts, and pronounced that tenet *concerning the expropriation of Chriſt and his apoſtles, a peſtilential, erroneous, damnable, and blaſphemous doctrine, ſubverſive of the catholic faith*, and declared all ſuch as adhered to it, *obſtinate heretics* and *rebels againſt the church* [c]. In conſequence of this mercileſs decree, great numbers of thoſe who perſiſted in aſſerting that CHRIST and his apoſtles were exactly ſuch Mendicants as FRANCIS would have his brethren to be, were apprehended by the Dominican inquiſitors, who were implacable enemies of the Franciſcans, and committed to the flames. The hiſtory of *France* and *Spain*, *Italy* and *Germany*, during this and the following century, abound with inſtances of this deplorable cruelty.

The attempts of the Franciſcans againſt the pope.

XXX. The zealous pontif purſued this affair with great warmth for ſeveral years ſucceſſively, and as this conteſt ſeemed to have taken its riſe from the books of PIERRE D'OLIVE, he branded with infamy, in the year 1325, the *Poſtilla*, and the other writings of that author as pernicious and heretical [d]. The next ſtep he took was to ſummon to *Avignon* ſome of the more learned and eminent brethren of the Franciſcan order, of whoſe writings and eloquence he was the moſt apprehenſive, and to detain them at

---

reader ſhould chiefly conſult that impartial writer ALVARUS PELAGIUS, *De planctu eccleſiæ*, lib. ii. c. 60. *ſ.* 145. as alſo LUC. WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 394. *ſ.* each of them blames JOHN. BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 191. *ſ.*

[a] WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom. vii. p. 2. 22.—AVAR. PELAGIUS, *De planctu eccleſiæ*, lib. ii. *f.* 167.—TRITHEMIUS, *Annal. Hirſaug.* tom. ii. p. 157.—THEOD. DE NIEM, in ECCARDI *Corpore Hiſtor. med. ævi*, tom. vii. p. 1491.

[b] WADDINGI, tom. vii. p. 36.—*Contin. de* NANGIS, in DACHERII *Spicilegio*, tom. iii. p. 83.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 205.—*Benedictinor. Gallia Chriſtiana*, tom. ii. p. 1515.

[c] This conſtitution, as well as the two former already mentioned, is publiſhed among the *Extravagantes*, tit. xiv *De verbor. ſignif.* WADDINGUS, tom. vii. p. 36. vigorouſly oppoſes this laſt, which is pretty extraordinary in a man ſo immoderately attached to the cauſe of the popes as he was.

[d] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vii. p. 47.—JO. GEORG. ECCARDI *Corpus Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 592 and 1491.

his court: and then to arm himſelf againſt the reſentment and indignation of this exaſperated ſociety, and to prevent their attempting any thing to his prejudice, he kept a ſtrict guard over them in all places, by means of his friends the Dominicans, MICHAEL DE CÆSENAS, who reſided in *Italy*, and was the head of the order, could but ill diſſemble the hatred he had conceived againſt the pope, who therefore ordered him to repair to *Avignon*, in the year 1327, and there deprived him of his office [e]. But prudent as this violent meaſure might be, it ſerved only to inflame the enraged Franciſcans more than ever, and to confirm them in their attachment to the ſcheme of abſolute poverty. For no ſooner did the bitter and well-known conteſt between JOHN XXII, and the emperor LEWIS of *Bavaria*, break out, than the principal champions of the Franciſcan cauſe, ſuch as MARSILIUS of *Padua*, and JO. DE JANDUNO, or GENOA, fled to the emperor, and under his protection publiſhed the moſt virulent pieces imaginable, in which they not only attacked JOHN perſonally, but alſo levelled their ſatires at the power and authority of the popes in general [f]. This example was ſoon followed by others, particularly by MICH. CÆSENAS, and WILLIAM OCCAM, who excelled moſt men of his time in ſubtilty and accuteneſs of genius, and alſo by F. BONAGRATIA of *Bergamo*. They made their eſcape by ſea from *Avignon*, in the year 1327, went firſt to the emperor, who was, at that time, in *Italy*, and from thence proceeded to *Munich*. They were ſoon joined by many others, ſuch as BERENGARIUS, FRANCIS DE ESCULO, and HENRY DE HALEM, who were highly and deſervedly eſteemed on account of their eminent parts and extenſive learning [g]. All theſe learned fugitives defended the inſtitute of their founder in long and laboured treatiſes, in which they reduced the papal dignity and authority within a very narrow compaſs, and loaded the pontifs with reproaches and invectives. OCCAM ſurpaſſed them all in the keenneſs and ſpirit of his ſatire, and hence his *Dialogues*, together with his other productions, which were peruſed with avidity, and tranſmitted down to ſucceeding generations, gave, as it were, a mortal blow to the ambition and majeſty of the Roman pontifs.

Lewis of Bavaria becomes the patron of the Franciſcans.

XXXI. On the other hand, the emperor, LEWIS of *Bavaria*, to expreſs his gratitude to theſe his defenders, not only made the cauſe of the Franciſcans his own, but alſo adopted their favourite ſentiment concerning the poverty of CHRIST and his apoſtles. For among the hereſies and errors of which he publicly accuſed JOHN XXII, and for which he deprived him of the pontificate, the principal and moſt pernicious one, in the opinion of the emperor, was his maintaining that the poverty of CHRIST did not exclude all right and property in what he uſed as a ſubſiſtence [*b*]. The *Fratricelli*, *Beghards*, *Beguines*, and *Spirituals*, then at variance with the pope, were effectually protected by the emperor, in *Germany*, againſt the attempts of the inquiſitors; ſo that during his reign that country was over-run with ſhoals of Mendicant friars. There was ſcarce a province or city in the empire that did not abound with *Beghards* and *Beguines*, that is, monks profeſſing the third rule of St. FRANCIS, and who placed the chief excellence of the Chriſtian life in a voluntary and abſolute poverty [*i*]. The Dominicans, on the other hand, as enemies to the Franciſcans, and friends to the pope, were treated with great ſeverity by his imperial majeſty, who baniſhed them with ignominy out of ſeveral cities [*k*].

---

[e] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vii. p. 69. 74.

[f] LUC. DACHERII *Spicilegium*, tom. iii. p. 85. *ſ.* *Bullar. Roman.* tom. vi. p. 167. EDM. MARTENE, *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. ii. p. 695. 704. BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 216. There is a very noted piece on this ſubject written by MARSILIUS of *Padua*, who was profeſſor at *Vienna*, which was publiſhed in 8vo at *Francfort*, by FRANC. GOMARUS, 1592, and is entitled *Defenſor pro Ludovico Bavaro adverſus uſurpatum Romani Pontificis juriſdictionem.*

[g] WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vii. p. 81.—MARTENE, *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. ii. p. 749. 757. *ſ.* 781.—TRITHEMII *Annal. Hirſaug.* tom. ii. p. 167.—BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 217.—ECCARDI *Corpus Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 1034.—BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 293. 315.—The reader may alſo conſult thoſe writers who have compiled *Indexes* and *Collections of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians.*

Peace is made between the Franciſcans and the pope.

XXXII. The rage of the contending parties ſubſided greatly from the year 1329. The pope cauſed a diet of the Franciſcans to be held that year at *Paris*, where, by means of cardinal BERTRAND, who was preſident of the aſſembly, and the Pariſian doctors, who were attached to his intereſts, he ſo far ſoftened the reſentment of the greateſt part of the brethren, that they ceaſed to defend the conduct of MICHAEL CÆSENAS and his aſſociates, and permitted another preſident, GERARD ODDO, to be ſubſtituted in his room. They alſo acknowledge JOHN to be a true and lawful pope, and then terminated the diſpute concerning the poverty of Chriſt in ſuch an ambiguous manner, that the conſtitutions and edicts of NICHOLAS III and JOHN XXII, however contradictory, maintained their authority [*l*]. But notwithſtanding theſe pacific and mutual conceſſions, there were great numbers of the Franciſcans in *Germany*, *Spain*, and *Italy*, who would by no means conſent to this reconciliation. After the death of JOHN, BENEDICT XII, and CLEMENT VI took great pains to cloſe the breach, and ſhewed great clemency and tenderneſs towards ſuch of the order as thought the inſtitute of their founder more ſacred than the papal bulls. This lenity had ſome good effects. Many who had withdrawn themſelves from the ſociety were hereby induced to return to it, in which number were FRANCIS DE ESCULO, and others, who had been ſome of JOHN's moſt inveterate enemies [*m*]. Even thoſe who would not be prevailed on to return to their order ceaſed to inſult the popes, obſerved the rules of their founder in a quiet and inoffenſive manner, and would have no ſort of connexion with thoſe *Fratricelli* and

---

[*b*] See *Proceſſus Ludovici contra Johannem, A.* 1328. *d.* 12 *Dec. datus*, in BALUZII *Miſcellaneis*, tom. ii. p. 522. and alſo his *Appellatio*, p. 494.

[*i*] I have many pieces upon this ſubject that were never publiſhed.

[*k*] MART. DIEFENBACH. *De mortis genere, quo Henricus* VII *obiit*, p. 145. and others.—ECCARDI *Corpus Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 2103.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 220.

[*l*] WADDINGI *Annales*, tom vii. p. 94.—DACHERII *Spicilegium*, tom. iii. p. 91.

[*m*] ARGENTRE, *Collectio judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 343.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 281.—WADDINGI *Annal.* tom. vii. p. 313.

Tertiaries in *Italy*, *Spain*, and *Germany*, who contemned the papal authority [*n*].

The diſtreſſes of the Spirituals, Beghards, &c. in *Germany*.

XXXIII. The German Franciſcans, who were protected by the emperor Lewis, held out their oppoſition much longer than any of the reſt. But in the year 1347, their imperial patron being dead, the halcyon days of the Franciſcan *Spirituals*, as alſo of their aſſociates the *Beghards*, or *Tertiaries*, were at an end in *Germany*. For in the year 1345, his ſucceſſor Charles IV, having been advanced to the imperial throne by the intereſt of the pope, was ready, in his turn, to gratify the deſires of the court of *Rome*, and accordingly ſupported, both by his edicts and by his arms, the inquiſitors who were ſent by the Roman pontif againſt his enemies, and ſuffered them to apprehend and put to death all of theſe enemies that came within their reach. Theſe miniſters of papal vengeance exerted their power chiefly in the diſtrict of *Magdeburg* and *Bremen*, *Thuringia*, *Saxony*, and *Heſſe*, where they extirpated all the *Beghards*, as well as the *Beguines*, or *Tertiaries*, the aſſociates of thoſe Franciſcans, who held that Christ and his apoſtles had no property in any thing. Theſe ſevere meaſures were approved by Charles IV, who then reſided in *Italy*, at *Lucca*, from whence, in the year 1369, he iſſued out ſevere edicts, commanding all the German princes to extirpate out of their dominions the *Beghards* and *Beguines*, or, as he himſelf interpreted the name, the *voluntary beggars* [*o*], as enemies of the church and of the Roman empire, and to aſſiſt the *inquiſitors* in their proceedings againſt them. By another edict publiſhed not long after, he gave the houſes of the *Beghards* to the *tribunal* of the *inquiſition*, ordering them to be converted into priſons for *heretics*: and, at the ſame time, ordered all the effects of the *Beguines* to be ſold publicly, and the profits ariſing from thence to be equally divided between the *inquiſitors*, the magiſtrates, and the poor of thoſe towns and cities where ſuch ſale ſhould be made [*p*]. The *Beghards*, being reduced to great ſtraits by this, and other mandates of the emperor, and by the conſtitutions of the popes, ſought a refuge in thoſe provinces of *Switzerland* that border upon the *Rhine*, and alſo in *Holland*, *Brabant*, and *Pomerania* [*q*]. But the edicts and mandates of the emperor, together with the papal bulls and inquiſitors, followed them wherever they went, and diſtreſſed them in their moſt diſtant retreats; ſo that during the reign of Charles IV, the greateſt part of *Germany* (*Switzerland* and thoſe provinces that are contiguous to it excepted) was thoroughly purged of the *Beggards*, or rebellious Franciſcans, both *perfect* and *imperfect*.

[*n*] Waddingi *Annal.* tom. vii. p. 116. 126.—Argentre *l. c.* tom. i. p. 343, &c.

[*o*] In High Dutch *Die wilgen Armen.*

[*p*] I have in my poſſeſſion this edict, with other laws of Charles IV, enacted on this occaſion, as alſo many of the papal conſtitutions, and other records which illuſtrate this affair, and which undoubtedly deſerve to ſee the light. It is certain, that Charles IV himſelf, in his edicts and mandates, clearly characterizes thoſe people, whom he there ſtyles *Beggards* and *Beguines* as *Franciſcan Tertiaries*, belonging to that party of the order then at variance with the pope. *They are* (to uſe the emperor's own words, in his edict iſſued out at *Lucca*, and bearing date the 16th of June 1369) *a pernicious ſect, who pretend to a ſacrilegious and heretical poverty, and who are under a vow that they neither ought to have, nor will have, any property, whether ſpecial or common, in the goods they uſe* (this is the poverty of the Franciſcan inſtitute, which John XXII ſo ſtrenuouſly oppoſed) *which they extend even to their wretched habits.*—For ſo the Spirituals and their aſſociates uſed to do.

[*q*] See Odor. Raynaldus, *Annal. Eccleſ. ad A.* 1372, § xxxiv. p. 513. See alſo the books of Felix Malleolus, written in the following century againſt the *Beggards* in *Switzerland.*

Their diviſions ſo far from being extinguiſhed by theſe proceedings, that the Franciſcan order is ſplit into two conſiderable parties.

XXXIV. But neither edicts, bulls, or inquiſitors, could entirely pluck up the roots of this inveterate diſcord. For ſo ardently were many of the brethren bent upon obſerving, in the moſt perfect and rigorous manner, the inſtitute of St. FRANCIS, that numbers were to be found in all places who either withſtood the preſident of the ſociety, or, at leaſt, obeyed him with reluctance. At once therefore to ſatiſfy both the laxer and more rigid party, after various methods had been tried to no purpoſe, a diviſion of the order was agreed to. Accordingly, in the year 1368, the preſident conſented that PAULUTIUS FULGINAS, who was the chief of the more rigid Franciſcans in *Italy*, together with his aſſociates, who were pretty numerous, ſhould live ſeparately from the reſt of the brethren, according to the rules and cuſtoms they had adopted, and follow the inſtitute of their founder in the ſtricteſt and moſt rigorous manner. The *Spirituals* and the followers of OLIVE, whoſe ſcattered remains were yet obſervable in ſeveral places, joined themſelves gradually and imperceptibly to this party. And as the number of thoſe who were fond of the *ſeverer diſcipline* continually encreaſed in many provinces, the popes thought proper to approve that inſtitute, and to give it the ſolemn ſanction of their authority. In conſequence of this, the Franciſcan order was divided into two large bodies, which ſubſiſt to this day, *viz.* the *Conventual Brethren*, and the *Brethren of the obſervation*. Thoſe who gave up the ſtrict ſenſe of the expreſſions in which the inſtitute of their founder was conceived, and adopted the modifications that were given of them by the pontifs, were called by the former name; and the council of *Conſtance* conferred the latter upon thoſe who choſe to be determined by the words of the inſtitute itſelf, rather than any explications of it [r]. But the *Fratricelli*, together with the *Beghards*, whom we have frequently had occaſion to mention, abſolutely rejected this reconciliation, and perſiſted in diſturbing the peace of the church, during this and the following century, in the marquiſate of *Ancona*, and in other places.

New religious orders are founded.

XXXV. This century gave riſe to other religious ſocieties, ſome of which were but of ſhort duration, and the reſt never became famous. JOHN COLOMBINI, a nobleman of *Sienna*, founded, in the year 1368, the order of the *Apoſtolic Clercs*, who, becauſe they frequently pronounced the name of JESUS, were afterwards called *Jeſuates*. This inſtitution was confirmed by URBAN V the following year, and ſubſiſted till the laſt century, when it was aboliſhed by CLEMENT IX [s]. The brethren belonging to it profeſſed poverty, and adhered to the inſtitute of St. AUGUSTINE. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but aſſiſted the poor by their prayers, and other pious offices, and prepared medicines for them, which they diſtributed gratis [*t*]. But theſe ſtatutes were in a manner abrogated when CLEMENT diſſolved the order.

---

[r] See WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. viii. p. 209. 298. 326. 336. tom. ix. p. 59. 65. 78, &c.

[s] In the year 1668.

The ſect of the Cellite brethren and ſiſters. The Lollards.

XXXVI. Soon after the commencement of this century, the famous ſect of the *Cellite brethren and ſiſters* aroſe at *Antwerp*; they were alſo ſtyled the *Alexian brethren and ſiſters*, becauſe St. ALEXIUS was their patron; and they were named *Cellites*, from the cells in which they were uſed to live. As the clergy of this age took little care of the ſick and dying, and deſerted ſuch as were ſiezed with thoſe peſtilential diſorders which were then very frequent, ſome compaſſionate and pious perſons at *Antwerp* formed themſelves into a ſociety for the performance of thoſe religious offices which the Sacerdotal orders ſo ſhamefully neglected. Purſuant to this agreement, they viſited and comforted the ſick, aſſiſted the dying with their prayers and exhortations, took care of the interment of thoſe who were cut off by the plague, and on that account forſaken by the affrighted clergy, and committed them to the grave with a ſolemn funeral dirge. It was with reference to this laſt office, that the common people gave them the name of *Lollards* [*u*]. The example of theſe good people had ſuch an extenſive in-

---

[*t*] HIPP. HELYOT, *Hiſt. des Ordres*, tom. iii. p. 411. *ſ.*—FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif.* tom. iv. p. 189. *ſ.*—BONANNI and others who have compiled hiſtories of the religious orders.

[*u*] Many writers have given us large accounts concerning the ſect and name of the *Lollards*, yet none of them are to be commended for their fidelity, diligence, or accuracy on this head. This I can confidently aſſert, becauſe I have carefully and expreſly inquired into whatever relates to the *Lollards*; and from the moſt authentic records concerning them, both publiſhed and unpubliſhed, have collected copious materials from whence their true hiſtory may be compiled. Moſt of the German writers, as well as thoſe of other countries, affirm, that the *Lollards* were a particular ſect, who differed from the church of *Rome* in many religious points, and that WALTER LOLLHARD, who was burnt in this century at *Cologn*, was their founder. How ſo many learned men came to adopt this opinion is beyond my comprehenſion. They indeed refer to JO. TRITHEMIUS as the author of this opinion; yet it is certain, that no ſuch account of theſe people is to be found in his writings. I ſhall therefore endeavour, with all poſſible brevity, to throw all the light I can upon this matter, that they who are fond of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory may have a juſt notion of it.

The term *Lollhard* or *Lullhard*, or, as the ancient Germans write it, *Lollert*, *Lullert*, is compounded of the old German word *Lullen*, *Lollen*, *Lallen*, and the well known termination *hard*, with which many of the old High Dutch words end. *Lollen*, or *Lullen*, ſignifies to ſing with a low voice. It is yet uſed in the ſame ſenſe among the Engliſh, who ſay, *lull a ſleep*, which ſignifies to ſing any one into a ſlumber with a ſweet indiſtinct voice. See FRANC. JUNII *Etymologicum Anglicanum*, ab EDVARDO LYE, *Oxon.* 1743, *fol.* under the word *Lollard*. The word is alſo uſed in the ſame ſenſe among the Flemings, Swedes, and other nations, as appears by their reſpective *Dictionaries*. Among the Germans, both the ſenſe and pronunciation of it have undergone ſome alteration: for they ſay, *Lallen*, which ſignifies to *pronounce indiſtinctly*, or *ſtammer*. *Lollhard* therefore is a *ſinger*, or one who frequently ſings. For as the word *Beggen*, which univerſally ſignifies to *requeſt any thing fervently*, is applied to devotional requeſts, or prayers, and in the ſtricter ſenſe in which it is uſed by the High Dutch, denotes *praying fervently to God*; in the ſame manner, the word *Lollen*, or *Lullen*, is transferred from a common to a ſacred ſong, and ſignifies, in its moſt limited ſenſe, to *ſing a hymn*. *Lollhard* therefore, in the vulgar tongue of the ancient Germans, denotes a perſon who is *continually praiſing God with a ſong*, or ſinging *hymns to his honour*. HOSCEMIUS, a canon of *Liege*, has well apprehended and expreſſed the force of this word in his *Geſta Pontificum Leodienſium*, lib. i. cap. xxxi. *in* JO. CHAPEAVILLI *Geſtis Pontificum Tungrenſium et Leodienſium*, tom. ii. p. 350. *ſ.* *In the ſame year* (1309), ſays he, *certain ſtrolling hypocrites, who were called* LOLLARDS, or *praiſers of God, deceived ſome women of quality in Hainault and Brabant*. Becauſe thoſe who praiſed God, generally did it in verſe, therefore, in the Latin ſtyle of the middle age, to *praiſe God* meant to *ſing* to fluence, that in a little time ſocieties of the ſame ſort of *Lollards*, conſiſting both of men and women, were formed in moſt parts of *Germany* and *Flanders*, and were ſupported partly by their manual labours, and partly by the

---

him, and ſuch as were frequently employed in acts of adoration were called *religious ſingers*. And as prayers and hymns are regarded as a certain external ſign of piety towards God, therefore thoſe who aſpired after a more than ordinary degree of piety and religion, and for that purpoſe were more frequently occupied in ſinging hymns of praiſe to God than others, were, in the common popular language, called *Lollhards*. Hereupon this word acquired the ſame meaning with that of the term *Beghard*, which denoted a perſon remarkable for piety; for in all the old records, from the eleventh century, theſe two words are ſynonymous: ſo that all who are ſtyled *Beggards* are alſo called *Lollards*, which may be proved to a demonſtration from many authors, and particularly from many paſſages in the writings of FELIX MALLEOLUS againſt the *Beggards*: ſo that there are preciſely as many ſorts of Beggards as of Lollards. Thoſe whom the monks now call *Lay Brothers*, were formerly named *Lollard Brethren*, as is well obſerved by BARTHOL. SCHOBINGER, *Ad Joach. Vadianum de collegiis monaſteriiſque Germaniæ Veter.* lib. i. p. 24. in GOLDASTI *Scriptor. rerum Alemannicarum*, tom. iii.

The Brethren of the free ſpirit, of whom we have already given a large account, are by ſome ſtyled *Beggards*, by others *Lollards*. The followers of GERHARD GROOTE, or *Prieſts of the community*, are frequently called *Lollard Brethren*. The good man WALTER, who was burnt at *Cologn*, and whom ſo many learned men have unadviſedly repreſented as the founder of the ſect of the *Lollards*, is by ſome called a *Beggard*, by others a *Lollard*, and by others a *Minorite*. The Franciſcan *Tertiaries*, who were remarkable for their prayers, and other pious exerciſes, often go by the name of *Lollards*. The *Cellite brethren*, or *Alexians*, whoſe piety was very exemplary, did no ſooner appear in *Flanders* about the beginning of this century, than the people gave them the title of *Lollards*, a term much in uſe at that time. A particular reaſon indeed for their being diſtinguiſhed by this name was, that they were public ſingers, who made it their buſineſs to interr the bodies of thoſe who died of the plague, and ſang a dirge over them in a mournful and indiſtinct tone as they carried them to the grave. Among the many teſtimonies that might be alledged to prove this, we ſhall confine ourſelves to the words of JO. BAPT. GRAMAYE, a man eminently ſkilled in the hiſtory of his country, in his Work, entitled, *Antwerpia*, lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 16. *The Alexians*, ſays he, *who conſtantly employed themſelves about funerals, had their riſe at Antwerp*; *at which place, about the year* 1300, *ſome honeſt pious laymen formed a ſociety. On account of their extraordinary temperance and modeſty they were ſtyled* Matemanni (or Moderatiſts) *and alſo* LOLLARDS FROM THEIR ATTENDANCE ON FUNERAL OBSEQUIES.—*From their cells they were named Cellite brethren.* To the ſame purpoſe is the following paſſage in his work, entitled, *Lovanium*, p. 18. which is inſerted in the ſplendid folio edition of the *Belgic Antiquities*, publiſhed at *Louvain* in 1708: *The Alexians, who were wholly engaged in taking care of funerals, now began to appear. They were laymen, who, having wholly devoted themſelves to works of mercy, were named* LOLLARDS *and Matemanni* (or Moderatiſts). *They made it their ſole buſineſs to take care of all ſuch as were ſick, or out of their ſenſes. Theſe they attended both privately and publicly, and buried the dead.* The ſame learned author tells us, that he tranſcribed ſome of theſe particulars from *an old diary written in Flemiſh rhyme*. Hence we find in the *Annals of Holland and Utrecht*, in ANT. MATTHÆI *Annalect. vet. ævi*, tom. i. p. 431. the following words: *Die Lollardtjes die brochten de dooden by een*, i. e. *the Lollards who collected the dead bodies*; which paſſage is thus paraphraſed by MATTHÆUS, *The Managers of funerals, and carriers of the dead, of whom there was a fixed company, were a ſet of mean worthleſs creatures, who uſually ſpoke in a canting mournful tone, as if bewailing the dead*; *and hence it came to paſs, that a ſtreet in Utrecht, in which moſt of theſe people lived, was called the* Lollerſtreet. The ſame reaſon that changed the word *Beggard* from its primitive meaning, contributed alſo to give, in proceſs of time, a different ſignification to that of *Lollard*, even its being aſſumed by perſons that diſhonoured it. For among thoſe Lollards, who made ſuch extraordinary pretences to piety and religion, and ſpent the greateſt part of their time in meditation, prayer, and ſuch-like acts of piety, there were many abominable hypocrites who entertained the moſt ridiculous opinions, and concealed the moſt enormous vices under the ſpecious maſk of this extraordinary profeſſion. But it was chiefly after the riſe of the *Alexians*, or *Cellites*, that the name *Lollard* became infamous. For the prieſts and monks being inveterately exaſperated againſt theſe good men, propagated injurious ſuſpicions of them, and endeavoured to perſuade the people, that charitable donations of pious perſons. The magiſtrates and inhabitants of the towns, where theſe brethren and ſiſters reſided, gave them peculiar marks of favour and protection on account of their great uſefulneſs to the ſick and needy. But the clergy, whoſe reputation was not a little hurt by them, and the Mendicant friars, who found their profits diminiſhed by the growing credit of theſe new comers, perſecuted them vehemently, and accuſed them to the popes of many vices and intolerable errors. Hence it was, that the word *Lollard*, which originally carried a good meaning, became a term of reproach to denote a perſon who, under the maſk of extraordinary piety, concealed either enormous vices, or pernicious ſentiments. But the magiſtrates, by their recommendations and teſtimonials, ſupported the *Lollards* againſt their malignant rivals, and obtained many papal conſtitutions by which their inſtitute was confirmed, their perſons exempted from the cognizance of the inquiſitors, and ſubjected entirely to the juriſdiction of the biſhops. But as theſe meaſures were inſufficient to ſecure them from moleſtation, CHARLES, duke of *Burgundy*, in the year 1472, obtained a ſolemn bull from pope SIXTUS IV, ordering that the *Cellites*, or *Lollards*, ſhould be ranked among the religious orders, and delivered from the juriſdiction of the biſhops: and pope JULIUS II granted them yet greater privileges in the year 1506. Many ſocieties of this kind are yet ſubſiſting at *Cologn*, and in the cities of *Flanders*, though they have evidently departed from their ancient rules [w].

Greek writers.

XXXVII. Among the Greek writers of this century the following were the moſt eminent:

NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, whoſe *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* we have already mentioned;

MATTHÆUS BLASTARES, who illuſtrated and explained the canon laws of the Greeks;

BARLAAM, who was a very zealous champion in behalf of the Grecian cauſe againſt the Latins;

GREGORIUS ACINDYNUS, an inveterate enemy of the *Palamites*, of which ſect we ſhall give ſome account in its proper place;

JOHANNES CANTACUZENUS, famous for his hiſtory of his own time, and his confutation of the Mahometan law;

NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, who compiled the Byzantine hiſtory, and left ſome other monuments of his genius to poſterity;

---

innocent and beneficent as the *Lollards* ſeemed to be, they were in reality the contrary, being tainted with the moſt pernicious ſentiments of a religious kind, and ſecretly addicted to all ſorts of vices. Thus by degrees it came to paſs, that any perſon, who covered hereſies, or crimes, under the appearance of piety, was called a *Lollard*. So that it is certain this was not a name to denote any one particular ſect, but was formerly common to all perſons and all ſects who were ſuppoſed to be guilty of impiety towards God and the church, under an external profeſſion of extraordinary piety.

[w] Beſides many others whom it is not proper to mention here, ſee ÆGID. GELLENIUS, *De admiranda ſacra et civili magnitudine urbis Coloniæ*, lib. iii. *Syntagm.* li. p. 534 598. 603.—JO. BAPT. GRAMAYE, in *Antiquit. Belgicis.*—ANTON. SANDERUS, in *Brabantia et Flandria illuſtratis.*—AUB. MIRÆUS, in *operibus Diplomatico-Hiſtoricis*, and many other writers of this period in many places of their works. I may add, that thoſe who are ſtyled *Lollards*, are by many called *die Nollbrüder*, from *Nollen*, an ancient German word.

THEOPHANES, biſhop of *Nice*, a laborious defender of the truth of Chriſtianity againſt the Jews, and the reſt of its enemies;

NILUS CABASILAS, NILUS RHODIUS, and NILUS DAMYLA, who moſt warmly maintained the cauſe of their nation againſt all the Latin writers;

PHILOTHEUS, ſeveral of whoſe tracts are yet extant, and ſeem well adapted to excite a devotional temper and ſpirit;

GREGORY PALAMAS; of whom more hereafter.

Latin writers.

XXXVIII. From the prodigious number of the Latin writers of this century, we ſhall only ſelect the moſt famous. Among the ſcholaſtic doctors, who blended philoſophy with divinity, JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, a Franciſcan, and the great antagoniſt of THOMAS, held the firſt rank, and though not entitled to any praiſe for his candour and ingenuity, was by no means inferior to any of his contemporaries in acuteneſs and ſubtilty of genius [x].

After him the moſt celebrated writers of this claſs were DURANDUS of St. PORTIAN, who combated the commonly received doctrine of the divine cooperation with the human will [y]. ANTONIUS ANDRÆAS, HERVÆUS NATALIS, FRANCIS MAYRONIUS, THOMAS BRADWARDINE, an acute ingenious man [z], PETER AUREOLUS, JOHN BACON, WILLIAM OCCAM, WALTER BURLÆUS, PETER DE ALLIACO, THOMAS of *Straſburg*, and GREGORY DE RIMINI [a].

Among the Myſtic divines JO. TAULERUS and JO. RUYSBROCKIUS, though not entirely free from errors, were eminent for their wiſdom and integrity;

NICHOLAS LYRANUS acquired great reputation by his *Compendious Expoſition of the whole Bible*;

RAYNERIUS PISANUS is celebrated for his *Summary of Theology*, and ASTESANUS for his *Summary of Caſes of Conſcience*.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Chriſtian church during this century.

The corruption of religion.

I. ALL thoſe who are well acquainted with the hiſtory of theſe times muſt acknowledge, that religion, whether as taught in the ſchools, or inculcated upon the people as the rule of their conduct, was ſo extremely adulterated and deformed, that there was not a ſingle branch of the Chriſtian doctrine, which retained the leaſt trace of its primitive luſtre and beauty. Hence it may eaſily be imagined, that the *Waldenſes*, and others, who longed for a reformation of the church, and had ſeparated themſelves from the juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Rome*, though every where expoſed to the fury of the *inquiſitors* and monks, yet increaſed from day to day, and baffled all the attempts that were made to extirpate them. Many of theſe poor people having obſerved, that great numbers of their party periſhed by the flames and other puniſhments, fled out of *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, into *Bohemia* and the adjacent countries, where they afterwards aſſociated with the Huſſites and other Separatiſts from the church of *Rome*.

---

[x] The very laborious and learned LUC. WADDINGUS favoured the public with an accurate edition of the works of SCOTUS, which was printed at *Lyons* 1639, in twelve volumes, folio.—Compare WOOD, *Antiqq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 86. *ſ.* but eſpecially WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor. fratr.* tom. vi. p. 40. 107.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 70, &c.

[y] See JO. LAUNOIUS, in a ſmall treatiſe entitled, *Syllabus rationum, quibus Durandi cauſſa defenditur*, tom. i. Opp.—*Gallia Chriſt.* tom. ii. p. 723.

[z] RICH. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. iv. p. 232. & *Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt. par M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 360.—STEPH. SOUCIETUS, in *Obſervationibus ad h. l.* p. 703.—*Nouv. Dict. Hiſt. Crit.* tom. ii. p. 500. *ſ.*

[a] For a full account of all theſe perſons, ſee *Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xiv. p. 11, 12. *ſ.*

The ſtate of exegetical or explanatory theology.

II. NICHOLAS LYRANUS deſervedly holds the firſt rank among the commentators on the Holy Scriptures, having explained the Books both of the Old and New Teſtament in a manner far ſuperior to the prevailing taſte and ſpirit of his age. He was a perfect maſter of the Hebrew language, but not well verſed in the Greek, and was therefore much happier in his expoſition of the Old Teſtament, than in that of the New [*b*]. All the other divines, who applied themſelves to this kind of writing, were ſervile imitators of their predeceſſors. They either culled choice ſentences from the writings of the more ancient doctors; or elſe, departing from the obvious meaning of the words, they tortured the ſacred writers to accommodate them to ſenſes that were myſterious and abſtruſe. They who are deſirous of being acquainted with this art, may have recourſe to VITALIS à FURNO, his *Moral Mirrour of the Scriptures* [*c*], or to LUDOLPHUS of *Saxony*, in his *Pſaltery Spiritualized* [*d*]. The philoſophers, who commented upon the ſacred writings, ſometimes propoſed ſubtile queſtions drawn from what was called, in this century, *Internal Science*, and ſolved them in a dexterous and artful manner.

The didactic divines.

III. The greateſt part of the doctors of this century, both Greek and Latin, followed the rules of the peripatetic philoſophy in expounding and teaching the doctrine of religion; and the Greeks, from their commerce with the Latins, ſeemed to have acquired ſome knowledge of thoſe methods of inſtruction uſed in the weſtern ſchools. Even to this day the Greeks read, in their own tongue, the works of THOMAS, and other capital writers of the ſcholaſtic claſs, which in this age were tranſlated and introduced into the Greek church by DEMETRIUS CYDONIUS, and others [*e*]. Prodigious numbers among the Latins were fond of this ſubtile method, in which JOHN SCOTUS, DURANDUS à S. PORTIAN, and WILLIAM OCCAM peculiarly excelled. Some few had recourſe to the deciſions of *Scripture* and *Tradition* in explaining divine truths, but they were overborne by the immenſe tribe of logicians, who carried all before them.

[*b*] RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nos*, p. 447. & *Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ. par M.* DU PIN, tom. i p. 352.—WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 264. *ſ.*

[*c*] *Speculum Morale totius Scripturæ.*

[*d*] *Pſalterium juxta Spiritualem ſenſum.*

[*e*] RICH. SIMON, *Creance de l'Egliſe Orientale ſur la Tranſubſtantiation*, p. 166.

IV. This

The adverſaries of the ſchool-divines. The Biblical divines.

IV. This ſuperiority of the ſchoolmen did not, however, prevent ſome wiſe and pious men among the *Myſtics*, and elſewhere, from ſeverely cenſuring this preſumptuous method of bringing before the tribunal of philoſophy matters of pure revelation. Many, on the contrary, were bold enough to oppoſe the reigning paſſion, and to recal the youth deſigned for the miniſtry, to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and the writings of the ancient fathers. This proceeding kindled the flame of diſcord almoſt every where; but this flame raged with peculiar violence in ſome of the more famous univerſities, eſpecially in thoſe of *Paris* and *Oxford*, where many ſharp diſputes were continually carried on againſt the *philoſophical* divines by thoſe of the *biblical* party, who, though greatly inferior to their antagoniſts in point of number, were ſometimes victorious. For the *philoſophical* legions, headed by Mendicants, Dominicans, and Franciſcans, were often extremely raſh in their manner of diſputing; they defined and explained the principal doctrines of revealed religion, in ſuch a way as really overturned them, and fell often into opinions that were evidently abſurd and impious. Hence it came to paſs, that ſome of them were compelled to abjure their errors, others to ſeek their ſafety by flight; ſome had their writings publicly burnt, and others were thrown into priſon [*f*]. However, when theſe commotions were quelled, moſt of them returned, though, with prudence and caution to their former way of thinking, perplexed their adverſaries by various contrivances, and deprived them of their reputation, their profits, and many of their followers.

Contentions among the ſchoolmen. The Scotiſts and Thomiſts.

V. It is remarkable, that theſe *ſcholaſtic* doctors, or *philoſophical* theologiſts, far from agreeing among themſelves, were furiouſly engaged in diſputations with each other concerning many points. The flame of their controverſy was, in this century, ſupplied with plentiful acceſſions of fuel, by JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, an Engliſhman, of the Franciſcan order, who was extremely eminent for the ſubtilty of his genius, and who, animated againſt the Dominicans by a warm ſpirit of jealouſy, had attacked and attempted to diſprove ſeveral doctrines of THOMAS AQUINAS. Upon this, the Dominicans taking the alarm, united from all quarters, to defend their favourite doctor, whom they juſtly conſidered as the common leader of the ſcholaſtics; while the Franciſcans, on the other hand, eſpouſed with ardor the cauſe of SCOTUS, whom they looked upon as a divine ſage ſent down from heaven to enlighten bewildered and erring mortals. Thus theſe powerful and flouriſhing orders were again divided; and hence the origin of the two famous ſects, the *Scotiſts* and *Thomiſts*, which, to this day, diſpute the field of controverſy in the Latin ſchools. The chief points about which they diſagree are, the adulterated and deformed, that there was not a ſingle branch of the Chriſtian doctrine, which retained the leaſt trace of its primitive luſtre and beauty. Hence it may eaſily be imagined, that the *Waldenſes*, and others, who longed for a reformation of the church, and had ſeparated themſelves from the juriſdiction of the biſhop of *Rome*, though every where expoſed to the fury of the *inquiſitors* and monks, yet increaſed from day to day, and baffled all the attempts that were made to extirpate them. Many of theſe poor people having obſerved, that great numbers of their party periſhed by the flames and other puniſhments, fled out of *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, into *Bohemia* and the adjacent countries, where they afterwards aſſociated with the Huſſites and other Separatiſts from the church of *Rome*.

[*f*] See BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. paſſim.—In the year 1340, ſeveral opinions of the ſchoolmen, concerning the Trinity and other doctrines, were condemend, p. 266.—In the year 1347, M. JO. DE MERCURIA and NICH. DE ULTRICURIA were obliged to abjure their errors, p. 298. 308.—In 1348, one SIMON was convicted of ſome horrible errors, p. 322.—The ſame fate, A. 1354, befel GUIDO of the Auguſtine order, p. 329. A. 1362, the like happened to one LEWIS, p. 374. to JO. DE CALORE, p. 377. A. 1365, to DION. SOULLECHAT, p. 382. *Oxford* alſo had its ſhare in tranſactions of this nature. See ANT. WOOD, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 153. 183. *ſ*.

The ſtate of exegetical or explanatory theology.

II. NICHOLAS LYRANUS deſervedly holds the firſt rank among the commentators on the Holy Scriptures, having explained the Books both of the Old and New Teſtament in a manner far ſuperior to the prevailing taſte and ſpirit of his age. He was a perfect maſter of the Hebrew language, but not well verſed in the Greek, and was therefore much happier in his expoſition of the Old Teſtament, than in that of the New [*b*]. All the other divines, who applied themſelves to this kind of writing, were ſervile imitators of their predeceſſors. They either culled choice ſentences from the writings of the more ancient doctors; or elſe, departing from the obvious meaning of the words, they tortured the ſacred writers to accommodate them to ſenſes that were myſterious and abſtruſe. They who are deſirous of being acquainted with this art, may have recourſe to VITALIS à FURNO, his *Moral Mirrour of the Scriptures* [*c*], or to LUDOLPHUS of *Saxony*, in his *Pſaltery Spiritualized* [*d*]. The philoſophers, who commented upon the ſacred writings, ſometimes propoſed ſubtile queſtions drawn from what was called, in this century, *Internal Science*, and ſolved them in a dexterous and artful manner.

The didactic divines.

III. The greateſt part of the doctors of this century, both Greek and Latin, followed the rules of the peripatetic philoſophy in expounding and teaching the doctrine of religion; and the Greeks, from their commerce with the Latins, ſeemed to have acquired ſome knowledge of thoſe methods of inſtruction uſed in the weſtern ſchools. Even to this day the Greeks read, in their own tongue, the works of THOMAS, and other capital writers of the ſcholaſtic claſs, which in this age were tranſlated and introduced into the Greek church by DEMETRIUS CYDONIUS, and others [*e*]. Prodigious numbers among the Latins were fond of this ſubtile method, in which JOHN SCOTUS, DURANDUS à S. PORTIAN, and WILLIAM OCCAM peculiarly excelled. Some few had recourſe to the deciſions of *Scripture* and *Tradition* in explaining divine truths, but they were overborne by the immenſe tribe of logicians, who carried all before them.

[*b*] RICH. SIMON, *Hiſtoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nos*, p. 447. & *Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ. par M.* DU PIN, tom. i p. 352.—WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 264. *ſ.*

[*c*] *Speculum Morale totius Scripturæ.*

[*d*] *Pſalterium juxta Spiritualem ſenſum.*

[*e*] RICH. SIMON, *Creance de l'Egliſe Orientale ſur la Tranſubſtantiation*, p. 166.

IV. This

The adverſaries of the ſchool-divines. The Biblical divines.

IV. This ſuperiority of the ſchoolmen did not, however, prevent ſome wiſe and pious men among the *Myſtics*, and elſewhere, from ſeverely cenſuring this preſumptuous method of bringing before the tribunal of philoſophy matters of pure revelation. Many, on the contrary, were bold enough to oppoſe the reigning paſſion, and to recal the youth deſigned for the miniſtry, to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and the writings of the ancient fathers. This proceeding kindled the flame of diſcord almoſt every where; but this flame raged with peculiar violence in ſome of the more famous univerſities, eſpecially in thoſe of *Paris* and *Oxford*, where many ſharp diſputes were continually carried on againſt the *philoſophical* divines by thoſe of the *biblical* party, who, though greatly inferior to their antagoniſts in point of number, were ſometimes victorious. For the *philoſophical* legions, headed by Mendicants, Dominicans, and Franciſcans, were often extremely raſh in their manner of diſputing; they defined and explained the principal doctrines of revealed religion, in ſuch a way as really overturned them, and fell often into opinions that were evidently abſurd and impious. Hence it came to paſs, that ſome of them were compelled to abjure their errors, others to ſeek their ſafety by flight; ſome had their writings publicly burnt, and others were thrown into priſon [*f*]. However, when theſe commotions were quelled, moſt of them returned, though, with prudence and caution to their former way of thinking, perplexed their adverſaries by various contrivances, and deprived them of their reputation, their profits, and many of their followers.

Contentions among the ſchoolmen. The Scotiſts and Thomiſts.

V. It is remarkable, that theſe *ſcholaſtic* doctors, or *philoſophical* theologiſts, far from agreeing among themſelves, were furiouſly engaged in diſputations with each other concerning many points. The flame of their controverſy was, in this century, ſupplied with plentiful acceſſions of fuel, by John Duns Scotus, an Engliſhman, of the Franciſcan order, who was extremely eminent for the ſubtilty of his genius, and who, animated againſt the Dominicans by a warm ſpirit of jealouſy, had attacked and attempted to diſprove ſeveral doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. Upon this, the Dominicans taking the alarm, united from all quarters, to defend their favourite doctor, whom they juſtly conſidered as the common leader of the ſcholaſtics; while the Franciſcans, on the other hand, eſpouſed with ardor the cauſe of Scotus, whom they looked upon as a divine ſage ſent down from heaven to enlighten bewildered and erring mortals. Thus theſe powerful and flouriſhing orders were again divided; and hence the origin of the two famous ſects, the *Scotiſts* and *Thomiſts*, which, to this day, diſpute the field of controverſy in the Latin ſchools. The chief points about which they diſagree are, the

---

[*f*] See Boulay, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. paſſim.—In the year 1340, ſeveral opinions of the ſchoolmen, concerning the Trinity and other doctrines, were condemend, p. 266.—In the year 1347, M. Jo. de Mercuria and Nich. de Ultricuria were obliged to abjure their errors, p. 298. 308.—In 1348, one Simon was convicted of ſome horrible errors, p. 322.—The ſame fate, A. 1354, befel Guido of the Auguſtine order, p. 329. A. 1362, the like happened to one Lewis, p. 374. to Jo. de Calore, p. 377. A. 1365, to Dion. Soullechat, p. 382. *Oxford* alſo had its ſhare in tranſactions of this nature. See Ant. Wood, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 153. 183. *ſ.*

Nature of the divine co-operation with the human will, the *Meaſure of divine grace* that is neceſſary to ſalvation, the *Unity of form in man*, or perſonal identity, and other abſtruſe and minute queſtions, the enumeration of which is foreign to our purpoſe. We ſhall only obſerve, that what contributed moſt to exalt the reputation of SCOTUS, and to cover him with glory, was his demonſtration and defence of, what was called, the *Immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary*, againſt the Dominicans, who entertained different notions of that myſterious event [*g*].

The Myſtics.

VI. A prodigious number of the people, denominated *Myſtics*, reſided and propagated their tenets in almoſt every part of *Europe*. There were, undoubtedly, among them many perſons of eminent piety, who endeavoured to wean men from an exceſſive attachment to the external part of religion, and to form them to the love of God, and the practice of genuine virtue. Such among others were TAULERUS, RUYSBROCKIUS, SUSO, and GERARD of *Zutphen* [*h*], who, it muſt be confeſſed, have left many writings that are exceedingly well calculated to excite pious diſpoſitions in the minds of their readers; though want of judgment, and a propenſity to indulge enthuſiaſtic viſions, is a defect common to them all. But there were alſo ſome ſenſeleſs fanatics belonging to this party, who ran about, from place to place, recommending a moſt unaccountable extinction of all the rational faculties, whereby they idly imagined the human mind would be transfuſed into the divine eſſence, and thus led their proſelytes into a fooliſh kind of piety, that in too many caſes bordered nearly upon licentiouſneſs. The religious frenzy of theſe enthuſiaſts roſe to ſuch a height, as rendered them deteſtable to the ſoberer ſort of *Myſtics*, who charged their followers to have no connexions with them [*i*].

Moral writers.

VII. It is needleſs to ſay much concerning thoſe who applied themſelves to the ſtudy of morality, ſeeing their merit is much of the ſame kind with that of authors whom we have already mentioned: though it may be proper to mention two circumſtances by which the reader may aſcertain the true ſtate of this ſcience. The firſt is, that about this time more writers, than in any former century, made it their buſineſs to collect and ſolve, what they ſtyled, *Caſes of conſcience*, by which ASTESANUS, an Italian, MONALDUS, and BARTHOLOMEW of ST. CONCORDIA, acquired a reputation ſuperior to any of their contemporaries. This kind of writing was of a piece with the education then received in the ſchools, ſince it taught people to quibble and wrangle, inſtead of forming them to a ſound faith and a ſuitable practice. A ſecond thing worthy of notice is, that moral duties were explained and their practice enforced by allegories and compariſons of a new and whimſical kind, even by examples drawn from the natures, properties, and actions of the brute creation. Theſe writers began, for inſtance, by explaining the nature and qualities of ſome particular animal, and then applied their deſcription to human life and manners, to characterize the virtues and vices of moral agents. The moſt remarkable productions of this ſort are Nieder's *Formicarius*, a treatiſe concerning *Bees*, by Thomas Brabantinus, Hugo de St. Victor's diſſertation upon *Beaſts*, and a tract of Thomas Walley's entitled, *The Nature of Brute Animals moralized*.

[*g*] See WADDINGUS, *Annal. Minor.* tom vi. p. 52.

[*h*] Concerning theſe authors, ſee PETR. POIRET, *Biblioth. Myſticorum*; and GODOFR. ARNOLD, *Hiſtor. et deſcriptio Theol. Myſticæ.* Concerning TAULERUS and SUSO, ECHARDUS treats expreſsly in his *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 653. 677. See alſo *Acta Sanctor. Januar.* tom. ii. p. 652.

[*i*] JOH. RUYSBROCKIUS inveighed bitterly againſt them, as appears from his *Work* publiſhed by LAUR. SURIUS, p. 50. 378. as alſo from his treatiſe *De vera contemplatione*, cap. xviii. p. 608.

Controverſialiſts.

VIII. The defenders of Chriſtianity in this age were, generally ſpeaking, unequal to the glorious cauſe they undertook to ſupport, nor do their writings diſcover any ſtriking marks of genius, dexterity, perſpicuity, or candour. Some productions, indeed, appeared from time to time, that were not altogether unworthy of notice. The learned Bradwardine, an Engliſh divine, advanced many pertinent and ingenious things towards the confirmation of the truth of Chriſtianity in general, in a *Book upon Providence*. The book, entitled, *Collyrium Fidei contra Hæreticos*, or, *Eye-ſalve of Faith againſt the Heretics*, ſhews that its author Alvarus Pelagius was a well-meaning and judicious man, though he has by no means exhauſted the ſubject in this performance. Nicholas Lyra wrote againſt the Jews, as did alſo Porchetus Salvaticus, whoſe treatiſe, entitled *The Triumph of Faith*, is chiefly borrowed from the writings of Raymond Martin. Both theſe writers are much inferior to Theophanes, whoſe *Book againſt the Jews*, and his *Harmony between the Old and New Teſtament*, contain many obſervations that are by no means contemptible.

State of the controverſy between the Greeks and Latins.

IX. During this century there were ſome promiſing appearances of a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins. For the former, apprehending they ſhould want the aſſiſtance of the Latins to ſet bounds to the power of the Turks, which about this time was continually increaſing, often pretended a willingneſs to ſubmit to the Latin canons. Accordingly, A. D. 1339, Andronicus, the Younger, ſent Barlaam as his ambaſſador into the weſt, to deſire a reconciliation in his name. In the year 1349, another Grecian embaſſy was ſent to Clement VI for the ſame purpoſe, and, in 1356, a third was diſpatched upon a like errand to Innocent VI, who reſided at *Avignon*. Nor was this all; for in the year 1367, the Grecian patriarch arrived at *Rome* in order to negotiate this important matter, and was followed, in the year 1369, by the emperor himſelf John Palæologus, who undertook a journey into *Italy*, and, in order to conciliate the friendſhip and good-will of the Latins, publiſhed a confeſſion of his faith, which was agreeable to the ſentiments of the Roman pontif. But, notwithſtanding theſe prudent and pacific meaſures, the major part of the Greeks could not be perſuaded by any means to drop the controverſy, or to be reconciled to the church of *Rome*, though ſeveral of them, from views of intereſt or ambition, expreſſed a readineſs to ſubmit to its demands; ſo that this whole century was ſpent partly in furious debates, and partly in fruitleſs negotiations [k].

---

[k] See Henr. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 369.—Leo. Attatius, *De perpetua conſenſione eccleſ. orient. et occident.* lib. ii. cap. xvi, xvii. p. 782.—Luc. Waddingus, *Annal.*

X. In

The contention between the univerſity of *Paris* and the Dominicans.

X. In the year 1384, a furious controverſy aroſe at *Paris* between the Univerſity there and the Dominican Order. The author of it was JOHN DE MONTESONO, a native of *Arragon*, a Dominican friar and profeſſor of divinity, who, purſuant to the deciſions and doctrine of his Order, publicly denied that the bleſſed Virgin MARY was conceived without any ſtain of original ſin, and moreover aſſerted, that all who believed the *immaculate conception* were enemies of the true faith. The quarrel occaſioned by this proceeding would certainly have been ſoon compromiſed, had not JOHN, in a public diſcourſe, held ſome time in the year 1387, revived this opinion with more violence than ever. For this reaſon the college of divines, and afterwards the whole univerſity, condemned this, and ſome other tenets of MONTESONUS. For it may be proper to inform the reader, that the univerſity of *Paris*, principally induced thereto by the diſcourſes of JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, had, from the beginning almoſt of this century, publicly adopted the doctrine of the ſinleſs conception of the holy Virgin [*l*]. Upon this, the Dominicans, together with their champion MONTESONUS, appealed from the ſentence of the univerſity to pope CLEMENT VII at *Avignon*, and raiſed an outcry, that St. THOMAS himſelf was condemned by the judgment paſſed upon their brother. But before the pope could decide the affair, the accuſed friar fled from the court of *Avignon*, went over to the party of URBAN VI, who reſided at *Rome*, and thus, during his abſence, was excommunicated. Whether or no the pope approved the ſentence of the univerſity of *Paris* we cannot ſay. The Dominicans, however, deny that he did, and affirm, that MONTESONUS was condemned purely on account of his flight [*m*]; though there are many others, who aſſert that his opinion was alſo condemned. And as the Dominicans would not acknowledge the ſentence of the univerſity to be valid, they were expelled in the year 1389, and were not reſtored to their ancient honours in that learned body till the year 1404 [*n*].

Occaſioned by Monteſonus.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies uſed in the church during this century.

The alteration of the jubile.

I. WE muſt confine ourſelves to a general and ſuperficial view of the alterations that were introduced into the ritual of the church during this century, ſince it cannot reaſonably be expected we ſhould inſiſt largely upon this ſubject within the narrow limits of ſuch a work as this. One of

---

Minor. tom. viii. p. 29. 40. 107. 201. 289. 303. 212.—STEPH. BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 348. 380. 388. 403. 407. 410. 772.

[*l*] See WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 52. *ſ.*

[*m*] See JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 691.

[*n*] CÆS. EGASS DE BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. iv. p. 599. 618. 638.—STEPH. BALUZII *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 521. tom. ii. p. 992.—ARGENTRE, *Collectio judicior. de novis erroribus.* tom. i. p. 61.—JAC. DE LONGUEVAL, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xiv. p. 347.

the principal circumſtances that ſtrikes us here, is the change that was made in the time of celebrating the jubile. In the year 1350, Clement VI, in compliance with the requeſts of the people of *Rome*, enacted, that the *jubile*, which Boniface VIII had ordered to be held every hundredth year, ſhould be celebrated twice in every century [*o*]. In favour of this alteration, he might have aſſigned a very plauſible pretext; ſince it is well known that the Jews, whom the Roman pontifs were always ready to imitate in whatever related to pomp and majeſty, celebrated this ſacred ſolemnity every fiftieth year. But Urban VI, Sixtus VI, and other popes, who ordered a more frequent celebration of this ſalutary and profitable inſtitution, would have had more difficulty in attempting to ſatisfy thoſe who might have demanded ſufficient reaſons to juſtify this inconſtancy.

Feſtivals.

II. Innocent V inſtituted feſtivals ſacred to the memory of the *lance* with which our Saviour's ſide was pierced, the *nails* that faſtened him to the croſs, and the crown of thorns he wore at his death [*p*]. This, though evidently abſurd, was nevertheleſs pardonable upon the whole, conſidering the groſs ignorance and ſtupidity of the times. But nothing can excuſe the impious fanaticiſm and ſuperſtition of Benedict XII, who, by appointing a feſtival in honour of the marks of Christ's wounds, which, the Franciſcans tell us, were imprinted upon the body of their chief and founder by a miraculous interpoſition of the divine power, gave credit to that groſsly ridiculous, and blaſphemous fable. Pope John XXII, beſides the ſanction he gave to many other ſuperſtitions, ordered Chriſtians to add to their prayers thoſe words with which the angel Gabriel ſaluted the Virgin Mary.

Prayers.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the diviſions and hereſies that troubled the church during this century.

Controverſies excited by the Quietiſts.

I. DURING ſome part of this century the *Heſychaſts*, or, as the Latins call them, the *Quietiſts*, gave the Greek church a great deal of trouble. To aſſign the true ſource of it we muſt obſerve, that Barlaam, a native of *Calabria*, who was a monk of St. Basil, and afterwards biſhop of *Gieraci*, in *Calabria*, made a progreſs through *Greece* to inſpect the behaviour of the monks, among whom he found many things highly reprehenſible. He was more eſpecially offended at the *Heſychaſts* of mount *Athos*, in *Theſſaly*, who were the ſame with the Myſtics, or more perfect monks, and who, by a long courſe of intenſe contemplation, endeavoured to arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from every degree of tumult and perturbation. Theſe *Quietiſts*, in compliance with an ancient opinion of their principal doctors (who imagined that there was a celeſtial *light* concealed in the deepeſt retirements of the mind) uſed to ſit every day, during a certain ſpace of time, in a ſolitary corner, with their eyes eagerly and immoveably fixed upon the middle region of the belly, or navel, and boaſted, that, while they remained in this poſture, they found, in effect, a *divine light* beaming forth from the ſoul, which diffuſed through their hearts inexpreſſible ſenſations of pleaſure and delight [*q*]. To ſuch as inquired what kind of *light* this was, they replied, by way of illuſtration, that it was the *glory of God*, the ſame celeſtial radiance that ſurrounded CHRIST during his transfiguration on the mount. BARLAAM, entirely unacquainted with the cuſtoms and manners, looked upon all this as highly abſurd and fanatical, and therefore ſtyled the monks, who adhered to this inſtitution, *Maſſalians* and *Euchites* [*r*], and alſo gave them the new name of *Umbilicani* [*s*]. On the other hand, GREGORY PALAMAS, archbiſhop of *Theſſalonica*, defended the cauſe of theſe monks againſt BARLAAM [*t*].

[*o*] Baluzii *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 247. 287. 312. 887.—Muratorii *Antiquit. Ital.* tom. iii. p. 344. 481.

[*p*] See Jo. Henr. à Seelen, *Diſſ. de feſto Lanceæ et clavorum Chriſti.*—Baluzii *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 328. *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 417.

The ſtate of the controverſy between the Heſychaſts and Barlaamites.

II. In order to put an end to this diſſenſion, a council was held at *Conſtantinople* in the year 1341, in which the emperor himſelf, ANDRONICUS the younger, and the patriarch preſided. Here PALAMAS and the monks triumphed over BARLAAM, who was condemned by the council; whereupon he left *Greece*, and returned to *Italy*. Not long after this another monk, named GREGORY ACINDYNUS, renewed the controverſy, and, in oppoſition to the opinion maintained by PALAMAS, denied that God dwelt in an eternal light diſtinct from his eſſence, as alſo that ſuch a light was beheld by the diſciples on mount *Tabor*. The diſpute was now no longer concerning the monks, but of the light ſeen at mount *Tabor*, and of the nature of God. Nevertheleſs, he was condemned as a follower of BARLAAM, in another council held at *Conſtantinople*. Many aſſemblies were convened about this affair; but the moſt remakable of them all, was that held in the year 1351, in which the Barlaamites, and their adherents, received ſuch a fatal wound, in conſequence of the ſevere decrees enacted againſt them, that they were forced to yield, and leave the victory to PALAMAS. This prelate maintained, that God was incircled, as it were, with an *eternal light*, which might be ſtyled his *energy* or *operation*, and was diſtinct from his nature and eſſence; and that he favoured the three diſciples with a view of this light upon mount *Tabor*. Hence he concluded, that this divine *operation* was really different from the *ſubſtance* of the Deity; and further, that no Being could poſſibly partake of the divine *ſubſtance* or *eſſence*, but that finite natures might poſſeſs a ſhare of his divine light, or *operation*. The Barlaamites, on the contrary, denied theſe poſitions, affirming, that the properties and operations of the Deity were not different from his *eſſence*, and that there was really no difference between the attributes and eſſence of God conſidered in themſelves, but only in our conceptions of them, and reaſonings upon them [u].

[*q*] We have no reaſon to be ſurprized at, and much leſs to diſbelieve this account. For it is a fundamental rule with all thoſe people in the eaſtern world, whether Chriſtians, Mahometans, or Pagans (who maintain the neceſſity of abſtracting the mind from the body, in order to hold communion with God, which is exactly the ſame thing with the *contemplative* and *myſtic life* among the Latins) that the eyes muſt be ſteadily fixed every day for ſome hours upon ſome particular object; and that he who complies with this precept will be thrown into an extaſy, in which, being united to God, he will ſee wonderful things, and be entertained with ineffable delights. See what is ſaid concerning the *Siameſe* monks and *Myſtics* by ENGELB KÆMPFER, in his *Hiſtory of Japan*, tom. i. p. 30. and alſo concerning thoſe of *India*, in the *Voyages of Bernier*, tom. ii. p. 127. Indeed, I can eaſily admit, that they who continue long in the abovementioned poſture, will imagine they behold many things which no man in his ſenſes ever beheld or thought of. For certainly the combinations they form of the unconnected notions that ariſe to their fancy while their minds are in this odd and unnatural ſtate, muſt be moſt ſingular and whimſical; and that ſo much the more, as the rule itſelf which preſcribes the contemplation of a certain object as the means of arriving at a *viſion of the Deity*, abſolutely forbids all uſe of the faculty of reaſon during that extatic and ſublime interval. This total ſuſpenſion of reaſon and reflexion, during the period of contemplation, was not, however, peculiar to the eaſtern Quietiſts; the Latin Myſtics obſerved the ſame rule, and inculcated it upon their diſciples. And from hence we may ſafely conclude, that the many ſurprizing viſions, of which theſe fanatics boaſt, are fables utterly deſtitute of reaſon and probability. But this is not the proper place for enlarging upon prodigies of this nature.

[(*r*) The *Maſſalians* (ſo called from a Hebrew word which ſignifies *prayer*, as *Euchites* from a Greek word of the ſame ſignification) formed themſelves into a ſect during the fourth century under the reign of CONSTANTIUS. Their tenets reſembled thoſe of the Quietiſts in ſeveral reſpects.]

[*s*] Ομφαλοψύχοι.

[*t*] For an account of theſe two famous men, BARLAAM and GREGORY PALAMAS, ſee, in preference to all other writers, JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Græcæ* tom. x. p. 427. and 454.

The ſeverity of the inquiſition in the weſtern world.

III. In the Latin church the *inquiſitors*, thoſe active miniſters and executioners of papal juſtice, extended their vigilance to every quarter, and moſt induſtriouſly hunted out the remains of thoſe ſects who oppoſed the religion of *Rome*; even the *Waldenſes*, the *Cathariſts*, the *Apoſtoliſts*, and others; ſo that the hiſtory of theſe times abounds with numberleſs inſtances of perſons who were burnt, or otherwiſe barbarouſly deſtroyed, by theſe unrelenting inſtruments of ſuperſtitious vengeance. But none of theſe enemies of the church gave the *inquiſitors* and biſhops ſo much employment of this bloody kind, as the *Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit*, who went under the common name of *Beggards* and *Beguines* in *Germany* and *Flanders*, and were differently denominated in other provinces. For as this ſort of people profeſſed an uncommon and ſublime ſort of devotion, endeavouring to call off men's minds from the external and ſenſible parts of religion, and to win them over to the inward and ſpiritual worſhip of God, they were greatly eſteemed by many plain, well-meaning perſons, whoſe piety and ſimplicity were deceived by a profeſſion ſo ſeditious, and thus made many converts to their opinions. It was on this account that ſuch numbers of this turn and diſpoſition periſhed in the flames of perſecution during this century in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*.

---

[u] See JO. CANTACUZENUS, *Hiſtoriæ*, lib. ii. cap. xxxix. p. 263. and GREGOR. PONTANUS. NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, *Hiſtoriæ Byzantinæ*, lib. xi. cap. x. p. 277. and in many other places. But theſe two writers diſagree in many circumſtances. Many materials relative to this controverſy are yet unpubliſhed (ſee MONTFAUCON. *Biblioth. Coiſliniana*, p. 50. 174. 404) Nor have we ever been favoured with an accurate and well digeſted hiſtory of it. In the mean time the reader may conſult LEO ALLATIUS, *De perpetua conſenſione Orient. et Occid. eccleſiæ*, lib. ii. cap. xxii. p. 824.—HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 361.—DION. PETAVIUS, *Dogmat. Theol.* tom. i. lib. i. cap. xii. p. 76.—STEPH. DE ALTIMURA, *Panoplia contra Schiſma Græcor.* p. 381, &c.

Severe edicts againſt the Cathariſts, Beggards, Beguines, &c.

IV. This ſect was moſt numerous in thoſe cities of *Germany* that lay upon the *Rhine*, eſpecially at *Cologn*, which circumſtance induced HENRY I, archbiſhop of that dioceſe, to publiſh a ſevere edict againſt them, A. D. 1306 [w]; an example, that was ſoon followed by the biſhops of *Mentz*, *Triers*, *Worms*, and *Straſburg* [x]. And as there were ſome ſubtile acute men belonging to this party, that eminently keen logician, JOHN DUNS SCOTUS [y] was ſent to *Cologn* in the year 1308, to diſpute againſt them, and to vanquiſh them by dint of ſyllogiſm. In the year 1310, the famous MARGARET PORETTA, who made ſuch a ſhining figure in this ſect, was burnt at *Paris* with one of the brethren. She had undertaken to demonſtrate in an elaborate treatiſe, *That the ſoul, when abſorbed in the love of God, is free from the reſtraint of every law, and may freely gratify all its natural appetites without contracting any guilt* [z]. Pope CLEMENT V, exaſperated by this and other inſtances of the pernicious fanaticiſm, that had got among this ſect, publiſhed in a general council held at *Vienne* A. D. 1311, a ſpecial conſtitution againſt the *Beggards* and *Beguines* of *Germany*. And though the edict only mentions imperfectly the opinions of this ſect, yet, by the enumeration of them, we may eaſily perceive that the *Myſtic brethren and ſiſters of the free ſpirit* are the perſons principally intended [a]. CLEMENT, in the ſame council, iſſued another conſtitution, by which he diſſolved another and very different ſort of *Beguines* [b], who had hitherto been conſidered as a lawful and regular ſociety, and lived every where in fixed habitations appropriated to their order, but were now corrupted by the fanatics abovementioned. For the *Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit* had inſinuated themſelves into the greateſt part of the convents of the *Beguines*, where they inculcated, with great ſucceſs, their myſterious and ſublime ſyſtem of religion to theſe ſimple women. And theſe ſimple women were no ſooner initiated into this brillant and chimerical ſyſtem, than they were captivated with its deluſive charms, and babbled in the moſt abſurd and impious manner concerning the true worſhip of the deity [c].

Nevertheleſs the Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit could not be extirpated.

V. The *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, oppreſſed by ſo many ſevere edicts and conſtitutions, formed the deſign of removing from *Upper Germany* into the lower parts of the empire; and this emigration was ſo far put in execution, as that *Weſtphalia* was the only province which refuſed admiſſion to theſe diſperſed fanatics, and was free from their diſturbances. This was owing to the provident meaſures of HENRY, archbiſhop of *Cologn*, who having called a council, A. D. 1322, ſeriouſly admoniſhed the biſhops of his province of the approaching danger, and thus excited them to exert their utmoſt vigilance to prevent any of theſe people from coming into *Weſtphalia*. About the ſame time the *Beggards* [d] upon the *Rhine*, loſt their chief leader and champion, WALTER, a Dutchman, of remarkable eloquence, and famous for his writings, who came from *Mentz* to *Cologn*, where he was apprehended and burnt [e]. The death of this perſon was highly detrimental to the affairs of the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, but did not however ruin their cauſe nor extirpate their ſect. For it appears from innumerable teſtimonies, that theſe people, for a long time afterwards, not only held their private aſſemblies at *Cologn*, and in many other provinces of *Germany*, but alſo that they had ſeveral men among them of high rank and great learning, of which number HENRY AYCARDUS, or ECCARD, a Saxon, was the moſt famous. He was a Dominican, and alſo the ſuperior of that order in *Saxony*; a man of a ſubtile genius, and one who had acquitted himſelf with reputation as profeſſor of divinity at *Paris* [f]. In the year 1330, pope JOHN XXII endeavouring to ſuppreſs this obſtinate ſect by a new and ſevere conſtitution, in which the errors of the ſect of the *free ſpirit* are marked out in a more diſtinct and accurate manner than in the *Clementina* [g]. But his attempt was fruitleſs, the diſorder continued, and was combated both by the inquiſitors and biſhops in moſt parts of *Europe* to the end of this century.

---

[w] See *Statuta Colonienſia*, publiſhed in 4^{to} at *Cologn*, A. D. 1554. p. 58.

[x] JOHANNIS, *Scriptor. rerum Moguntinar.* tom. iii. p. 298.—MARTENE *Theſaur. Anecdotor.* tom. iv. p. 250.

[y] WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 108.

[z] LUC. DACHERII *Spicil. veter. Scriptor.* tom. iii. p. 63.—Jö. BALEUS, *De Scriptor. Britann. Centur.* iv. n. 88. p. 367. publiſhed in folio at *Baſil*, A. D. 1557.

[a] It is extant in the *Corpus Juris Canon. inter Clementinas*, lib. v. tit. iii. *De Hæreticis*, cap. iii. p. 1088.

[b] *In Jure Canonico inter Clementinas*, lib. iii. tit. xi, *De religioſis domibus*, cap. i. p. 1075. ed. Böhmer.

[c] For this reaſon, in the German records of this century, we often find a diſtinction of the *Beguines into thoſe of the right and approved claſs*, and thoſe of *the ſublime, or free ſpirit*: the former of whom adhered to the public religion; while the latter were corrupted by the opinions of the *Myſtics*.

[(d) By *Beggards* here Dr. MOSHEIM means particularly the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, who frequently paſſed under this denomination.]

[e] JO. TRITHEMII *Annal. Hirſaug*. tom. ii. p. 155.—SCHATEN, *Annal. Paderborn*. tom. ii. p. 250.—This is that famous WALTER whom ſo many eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians have repreſented as the founder of the ſect of the *Lollards*, and as an eminent martyr to their cauſe. Learned men conclude all this, and more from the following words of TRITHEMIUS. *But that ſame* WALTER *Lohareus* (ſo it ſtands in my copy, though I fancy it ought to have been *Lollhardus*; eſpecially as TRITHEMIUS, according to the cuſtom of his time, frequently uſes this word when treating of the ſects that diſſented from the church) *a native of Holland, was not well verſed in the Latin tongue*. I ſay, from this ſhort paſſage learned men have concluded that WALTER's ſurname was *Lollhard*, from whence, as from its founder and maſter, they ſuppoſed his ſect derived the name of *Lollards*. But it is very evident, not only from this, but from many other paſſages of TRITHEMIUS, that *Lollhard* was no ſurname but merely a term of reproach applied to all heretics whatever who concealed the poiſon of error under the appearance of piety. TRITHEMIUS ſpeaking of the very ſame man, in a paſſage which occurs a little before that we have juſt quoted, calls him *the head of the Fratricelli*, or *Minorites*: but the term *Minorites* was a very extenſive one, including people of various ſects. This WALTER embraced the opinions of the *Myſtics*, and was the principal doctor among thoſe *Brethren of the free ſpirit*, who lived on the banks of the *Rhine*.

[f] See ECHARDI *Scriptor. Prædicator*. tom. i. p. 507.—ODOR. RAYNALDUS, *Annal*. tom. xv. *ad A*. 1329. § lxx. p. 389.

[g] This new conſtitution of JOHN XXII was never publiſhed entire. It began with the following words: *In agro Dominico*, and was inſcribed thus, *contra ſingularia, dubia, ſuſpecta, et temeraria, quæ Beghardi et Beghinæ prædicant et obſervant*. We are favoured with a ſummary of it by HERM. CÖRNERUS, in *Chronico*, in ECCARDI *Corpore Hiſtor. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 1035, 1036. It is alſo mentioned by PAUL LANGIUS, in *Chronico Citizenſi*, in JO. PISTORII *Scriptor. rerum German*. tom. i. p. 1206.

VI. The

The perſecution of the Beguines, and its tragical concluſion.

VI. The *Clementina*, or conſtitution of the council of *Vienne* againſt the *Beguines*, or thoſe female ſocieties, who lived together in fixed habitations under a common rule of pious diſcipline and virtuous induſtry, gave riſe to a perſecution of theſe people, which laſted till the reformation by LUTHER, and ruined the cauſe both of the *Beguines* and *Beggards* in many places. For though the pope in his laſt *conſtitution* had permitted pious women to live as nuns in a ſtate of celibacy with, or without, taking the vow, and refuſed a toleration only to ſuch of them as were corrupted with the opinions of the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*; yet the vaſt number of enemies which the *Beguines* and *Beggards* had, partly among the mechanics, eſpecially the weavers, and partly among the prieſts and monks, took a handle from the *Clementina* to moleſt the *Beguines* in their houſes, to ſeize and deſtroy their goods, to offer them many other inſults, and to involve the *Beghards* in the like perſecution. The Roman pontif JOHN XXII afforded the *Beguines* ſome relief under theſe oppreſſions, in the year 1324, by means of a ſpecial *conſtitution*, in which he gave a favourable explication of the *Clementina*, and ordered that the goods, chattles, habitations, and ſocieties of the innocent *Beguines* ſhould be preſerved from every kind of violence and inſult; which example of clemency and moderation was afterwards followed by other popes. On the other hand, the Beguines, in hopes of diſappointing more effectually the malitious attempts of their enemies, and avoiding their ſnares, embraced in many places the third rule of S. FRANCIS, and of the AUGUSTINES. Yet all theſe meaſures in their favour could not prevent the loſs both of their reputation and ſubſtance, for from this time they were oppreſſed in ſeveral provinces by the magiſtrates, the clergy, and the monks, who had caſt a greedy eye upon their treaſures, and were extremely eager to divide the ſpoil [*b*].

The ſect of the Flagellants appears again.

VII. Some years before the middle of this century, while *Germany* and many other parts of *Europe* were diſtreſſed with various calamities, the *Flagellants*, a ſect forgotten almoſt every where, and eſpecially in *Germany*, made their appearance anew, and, rambling through many provinces, occaſioned great diſturbances. Theſe new *Flagellants*, whoſe enthuſiaſm infected every rank, ſex, and age, were much worſe than the old ones. They not only ſuppoſed that God might be prevailed upon to ſhew mercy to thoſe who underwent voluntary puniſhments, but propagated other tenets highly injurious to religion. They held, among other things, “ That flagellation “ was of equal virtue with baptiſm, and the other ſacraments: that the “ forgiveneſs of all ſins was to be obtained by it from God, without the “ merits of JESUS CHRIST; that the old law of CHRIST was ſoon to be “ aboliſhed, and that a new law enjoining the baptiſm of blood, to be

---

[*b*] I have collected a great number of particulars relating to this long perſecution of the *Beguines*. But the moſt copious of all the writers who have publiſhed any thing upon this ſubject, (eſpecially if we conſider his account of the perſecution at *Baſil*, and MÜLBERGIUS, the moſt inveterate enemy of the *Beguines*) in CHRISTIANUS WURSTISEN, or URSTISIUS, in his *Chronicum Baſilienſe*, written in German, lib. iv. cap. ix. p. cci. publiſhed in folio at *Baſil* 1580. There are now in my hands, and alſo in many libraries, MSS tracts of this celebrated MÜLBERGIUS, written againſt the *Beguines* in the following century.

"adminiſtred by whipping, was to be ſubſtituted in its place," with other tenets more or leſs enormous than theſe; whereupon CLEMENT VII thundered out anathemas againſt the Flagellants who were burnt by the *inquiſitors* in ſeveral places. It was, however, found as difficult to extirpate them, as it had been to ſuppreſs the other ſects of wandring fanatics [i].

The ſect of the Dancers.

VIII. Directly the reverſe of this melancholy ſect was the merry one of the *Dancers*, which, in the year 1373, aroſe at *Aix-la-Chapelle*, from whence it ſpread through the diſtrict of *Liege*, *Hainault*, and other parts of *Flanders*. It was cuſtomary among the fanatics for perſons of both ſexes, publicly, as well as in private, to fall a dancing all of a ſudden, and, holding each others hands, to continue their motions with extraordinary violence, till, being almoſt ſuffocated, they fell down breathleſs together, and they affirmed, that, during theſe interals of vehement agitation, they were favoured with wonderful viſions. Like the *Flagellants*, they wandered about from place to place, had recourſe to begging for their ſubſiſtence, treated with the utmoſt contempt both the prieſthood, and the public rites and worſhip of the church, and held ſecret aſſemblies. Such was the nature, and ſuch the circumſtances of this new frenzy, which the ignorant clergy of this age looked upon as the work of evil demons, who poſſeſſed, as they thought, this dancing tribe. Accordingly the prieſts of *Liege* endeavoured to caſt out the devils, which rendered theſe fanatics ſo merry, by ſinging hymns and applying fumigations of incenſe, and they gravely tell us, that the evil ſpirit was entirely vanquiſhed by theſe powerful charms [k].

The Knights Templars extirpated.

IX. The moſt heinous and abominable tribe of heretics that infected this century (if the enormities, with which they ſtand charged, be true) were the *Knights Templars*, who had been eſtabliſhed in *Paleſtine* about two hundred years before this period, and who are repreſented as enemies and deriders of all religion. Their principal accuſer indeed was a perſon whoſe teſtimony ought not to be admitted without caution. This accuſer was PHILIP the Fair, who addreſſed his complaints of the Templars to CLEMENT V, who was himſelf an avaritious, vindictive, and turbulent prince. The pope, though at firſt unwilling to proceed againſt them, was under a neceſſity of complying with the king's pleaſure; ſo that, in the year 1307, upon an appointed day, and for ſome time afterwards, all the knights who were diſperſed throughout *Europe*, and not in the leaſt apprehenſive of any impending evil, were ſeized and impriſoned. Such of them as refuſed to confeſs the enormities of which they were accuſed, were put to death; and thoſe who, by tortures and promiſes, were induced to acknowledge the truth of what was laid to their charge, obtained their liberty. In the year 1311, the whole order was extinguiſhed by the council of *Vienne*. A part of the rich revenues they poſſeſſed was beſtowed upon other orders, eſpecially on the knights of St. JOHN, now of *Malta*, and the reſt confiſcated to the reſpective treaſuries of the ſovereign princes in whoſe dominions their poſſeſſions lay.

---

[i] See BALUZII *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 160. 316. 319. & *Miſcellan.* tom. i. p. 50. —MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. i. p. 50. tom. iii. p. 241. tom. iv. p. 145.—HERM. GYGIS *Flores tempor.* p. 139.

[k] See BALUZII *Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 485.—ANT. MATTHÆI *Analecta vet. ævi*, tom. i. p. 51. where we find the following paſſage in the Belgic chronicle, which gives but an obſcure account of the ſect in queſtion: *A.* 1374. *Gingen* DE DANSERS, and then in Latin, *Gens impacata cadit, cruciata ſalvat.* The French *convulſioniſts* [or prophets] who in our age were remarkable for the vehemence and variety of their agitations, greatly reſembled *theſe brethren and ſiſter Dancers.*

The intolerable impiety of the Knights Templars is aſſigned as the cauſe of this ſeverity.

X. The *Knights Templars*, if their judges be worthy of credit, were a ſett of men who inſulted the majeſty of God, turned into deriſion the goſpel of CHRIST, and trampled upon the obligation of all laws human and divine. For it is affirmed, that candidates, upon their admiſſion to this order, were commanded to ſpit, as a mark of contempt, upon an image of CHRIST; and that, after admiſſion, they were bound to worſhip either a cat, or a wooden head covered with gold. It is farther affirmed, that, among them, the odious and unnatural act of ſodomy was a matter of obligation; that they committed to the flames the unhappy fruit of their lawleſs amours, and added to theſe, other crimes too horrible to be mentioned, or even imagined.

A reflexion concerning the crimes laid to their charge.

It will indeed be readily allowed that in this order, as in all the other religious ſocieties of this age, there were ſhocking examples of impiety and wickedneſs; but that the whole order of the *Templars* was thus enormouſly corrupt, is ſo far from being proved, that the contrary may be concluded even from the acts and records, yet extant, of the tribunals, before which they were tried and examined. If to this we add, that many of the accuſations advanced againſt them flatly contradict each other, and that many members of this unfortunate order, ſolemnly avowed their innocence, while languiſhing under the ſevereſt tortures, and even with their dying breath; it would ſeem probable, that king PHILIP ſet on foot this bloody tragedy, with a view to gratify his avarice, and glut his reſentment againſt the Templars, and eſpecially againſt their grand maſter, who had highly offended him [l].

---

[l] See the *Acts* annexed to PUTEAN's *Hiſtoire de la condemnation des Templiers*, and other writings of his relating to the hiſtory of *France*, publiſhed in 4^{to} at *Paris* 1654. Another edition of this book was printed in 8 ° at *Paris* 16 5: another at *Bruſſels* 1713, two volumes in 8^{vo}. The fourth, and moſt valuable of all, was publiſhed in 4^{to} at *Bruſſels* 1751, enlarged by the addition of a great number of proofs, by which every diligent and impartial reader will be convinced that the Templars were greatly injured. See alſo NICOLAI GÜRTLERI *Hiſtoria Templariorum, Amſtelod.* 1703, in 8^{vo}. If the reader has opportunity, he would do well to conſult STEPH. BALUZIUS, *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 8. 11, 12, &c. GERH. DU BOIS, *Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Pariſ.* tom. ii. p. 540. The principal cauſe of king PHILIP's indelible hatred againſt the Templars was, that, in his quarrel with BONIFACE VIII, the knights eſpouſed the cauſe of the pope, and furniſhed him with money to carry on the war; an offence this, which PHILIP could never pardon.

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

PART I.

The External History of the Church.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proſperous events that happened to the church during this century.

Cent. XV.

The Moors and Jews converted in *Spain* by force.

I. THE new ſubjects, that were added to the kingdom of **Christ** in this century, are altogether unworthy of that ſublime title, unleſs we proſtitute it by applying it to thoſe who made an external, though inſincere, profeſſion of Chriſtianity. **Ferdinand**, ſurnamed the *Catholic*, by the conqueſt of *Granada* in the year 1492, entirely overturned the dominion of the Moors, or Saracens, in *Spain*. Some time after this happy revolution, he iſſued out a ſentence of baniſhment againſt a prodigious multitude of Jews, who, to avoid the execution of this ſevere decree, diſſembled their ſentiments, and feigned an aſſent to the Goſpel of **Christ** [a]; and it is well known that, to this very day, there are both in *Spain* and *Portugal* an immenſe number of that diſperſed and wretched people, who wear the outward maſk of Chriſtianity to ſecure them againſt the rage of perſecution, and to advance their worldly intereſts. The myriads of Saracens, that remained in *Spain* after the diſſolution of their government, were at firſt ſollicited by exhortations and intreaties to embrace the Goſpel. When theſe gentle methods proved ineffectual to bring about their converſion, the famous **Ximenes**, arch-biſhop of *Toledo*, and prime miniſter of the kingdom, judged it expedient to try the force of the ſecular arm, in order to accompliſh that ſalutary purpoſe. But even this rigorous meaſure was without the deſired effect; the greateſt part of the Mahometans perſiſted,

---

[a] Jo. de Ferreras, *Hiſt. Generale d'Eſpagne*, tom. viii. p. 123. 132, &c.

ſiſted, with aſtoniſhing obſtinacy, in their fervent attachment to their voluptuous prophet [b].

The Samogetæ and Indians converted.

II. The light of the Goſpel was alſo carried in this century among the Samogetæ and the neighbouring nations, but with leſs fruit than was expected [c]. Towards the concluſion of this age, the Portugueſe, who cultivated with ardor and ſucceſs the art of navigation, had penetrated as far as *Æthiopia* and the *Indies*. In the year 1492, CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, by diſcovering the iſlands of *Hiſpaniola*, *Cuba*, and *Jamaica*, opened a paſſage into *America* [d], and after him AMERICUS VESPUTIUS, a citizen of *Florence*, landed on the continent of that vaſt region [e]. The new Argonauts, who diſcovered theſe nations, that had been hitherto unknown to the inhabitants of *Europe*, judged it their duty to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth. The firſt attempt of this pious nature was made by the Portugueſe among thoſe Africans, who inhabit the kingdom of *Congo*, and who, together with their monarch, were converted all of a ſudden to the Roman faith in the year 1491 [f]. But what muſt we think of a converſion brought about with ſuch aſtoniſhing rapidity, and of a people which all at once without heſitation abandon their ancient and inveterate prejudices? Has not ſuch a converſion a ridiculous, or rather an afflicting, aſpect? After this religious revolution in *Africa*, ALEXANDER VI gave a rare ſpecimen of papal preſumption in dividing *America* between the Portugueſe and Spaniards, but ſhewed at the ſame time his zeal for the propagation of the Goſpel by the ardor with which he recommended to theſe two nations the inſtruction and converſion of the Americans, both in the iſles and on the continent of that immenſe region [g]. In conſequence of this exhortation of the pontif, a great number of Franciſcans and Dominicans were ſent into theſe countries to enlighten their darkneſs, and the ſucceſs of their miſſions is abundantly known [h].

CHAP. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

The decline of Chriſtianity in the Eaſt.

I. IN the vaſt regions of the eaſtern world, Chriſtianity loſt ground from day to day, and the Mahometans, whether Turks or Tartars, united their barbarous efforts to extinguiſh its bright and ſalutary luſtre. In *Aſiatic Tartary*, *Mogol*, *Tangut*, and the adjacent provinces, where the religion of JESUS had long flouriſhed, were now become the diſmal ſeats of ſuperſtition, which reigned among them under the vileſt forms. Nor in theſe immenſe tracts of land were there at this time any traces of Chriſtianity viſible except in *China*, where the Neſtorians ſtill preſerved ſome ſcattered remains of their former glory, and appeared like a faint and dying taper in the midſt of a dark and gloomy firmament. That ſome Neſtorian churches were ſtill ſubſiſting in theſe regions of darkneſs is undoubtedly certain; for in this century the Neſtorian pontif, in *Chaldæa*, ſent miſſionaries into *Cathay* and *China*, who were empowered to exerciſe the authority of biſhops over the Chriſtian aſſemblies, which lay concealed in the remoter provinces of theſe great empires [i]. It is at the ſame time almoſt equally certain, that even theſe aſſemblies did not ſurvive this century.

---

[b] ESPRIT FLECHIER, *Hiſtoire du Cardinal Ximenes*, p. 89.—GEDDES, *Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Moriſcoes*, in his *Miſcellaneous Tracts*, tom. i. p. 8.

[c] JO. HENRY HOTTINGER. *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. Sæc.* xv. p. 856.

[d] See CHARLEVOIX, *Hiſtoire de l'Iſle de St. Domingo*, tom. i. p. 64.

[e] See the *Life of Americus Veſputius*, written in Italian by the learned ANGELI MARIA BANDINI.

[f] LABAT, *Relation de l'Ethiope Occidentale*, tom. ii. p. 366.—JOS. FRANC. LAFITAU, *Hiſtoire des decouvertes et conquetes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde*, tom. i. p. 72.

[g] See the *Bull* itſelf, in the *Bullarium Romanum*, tom. i. p. 466.

[h] See THOM. MARIA MAMACHIUS, *Orig. et Antiquitat. Chriſtianar.* tom. ii. p. 326. where we have an account of the gradual introduction of the Chriſtian religion into *America*.—See alſo WADDING. *Annal. Minor.* tom. xv. p. 10.

Conſtantinople taken by the Turks.

II. The ruin of the Grecian empire was a new ſource of calamities to the Chriſtian church in the greateſt part of *Europe* and *Aſia*. When the Turks headed by MAHOMET II, an accompliſhed prince and a formidable warrior, had made themſelves maſters of *Conſtantinople* in the year 1453; the cauſe of Chriſtianity received a blow from which it has never, as yet, recovered. Its adherents in theſe parts had no reſources left which could enable them to maintain it againſt the perpetual inſults of their fierce and incenſed victors, nor could they ſtem that torrent of barbariſm and ignorance that ruſhed in with the triumphant arms of MAHOMET, and overſpred *Greece* with a fatal rapidity. The Turks took one part of the city of *Conſtantinople* by force of arms; the other ſurrendred upon terms [k]. Hence it was that in the former the public profeſſion of the Goſpel was prohibited, and every veſtige of Chriſtianity effaced; while the inhabitants of the latter were permitted to retain their churches and monaſteries during the whole courſe of this century, and to worſhip God according to the precepts of the goſpel and the dictates of their conſciences. This precious liberty was, indeed, conſiderably diminiſhed under the reign of SELIM I, and the Chriſtian worſhip was loaded with ſevere and deſpotic reſtrictions [l]. The outward form of the Chriſtian church was not, indeed, either changed or deſtroyed by the Turks, but its luſtre was eclipſed, its ſtrength was undermined, and it was gradually extenuated to a mere ſhadow under their tyrannic empire. The Roman pontif PIUS II wrote a warm and urgent letter to MAHOMET II, to perſuade that prince to profeſs the Goſpel; but this letter is equally deſtitute of piety and prudence [m].

---

[i] This circumſtance was communicated to the author in a letter from the learned Mr. THEOPHILUS SIGIFRED BAYER, one of the greateſt adepts in Eaſtern Hiſtory and Antiquities, that this or any other age has produced.

[(k) In this account Dr. MOSHEIM has followed the Turkiſh writers. And indeed their account is much more probable than that of the Latin and Greek hiſtorians, who ſuppoſe, that the whole city was taken by force, and not by capitulation. The Turkiſh relation diminiſhes the glory of their conqueſt, and therefore probably would not have been adopted, had it not been true.]

[l] DEMET. CANTEMIR, *Hiſtoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. i. p. 11. 46, 54, 55.

[m] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article MAHOMET II.

PART II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the ſtate of letters and philoſophy during this century.

Learning flouriſhes among the Latins.

I. THE Grecian and Oriental Muſes languiſhed under the deſpotic yoke of the Mahometans, their voices were mute, and their harps unſtrung. The republic of letters had a quite different aſpect in the Latin world, where the liberal arts and ſciences were cultivated with zeal and ſpirit under the moſt auſpicious encouragements, and recovered their ancient luſtre and glory. Several of the popes became their zealous patrons and protectors, among whom NICHOLAS V deſerves an eminent and diſtinguiſhed rank; the munificence and authority of kings and princes were alſo nobly exerted in this excellent cauſe, and animated men of learning and genius to diſplay their talents. The illuſtrious family of the Medicis in *Italy* [n], ALPHONSUS VI, king of *Naples*, and the other Neapolitan monarchs of the houſe of *Arragon* [o] acquired immortal renown by their love of letters, their liberality to the learned, and their ardent zeal for the advancement of ſcience. Hence the academies that were founded in *Germany*, *France*, and *Italy*, the libraries that were collected at a prodigious expence, and the honours and rewards that were propoſed to the ſtudious youth to animate their induſtry by the views of intereſt and the deſire of glory. To all theſe happy circumſtances, in favour of the ſciences, was now added an admirable diſcovery which contributed as much as any thing elſe to their propagation, I mean the *art of printing* firſt with wooden, and afterwards with metal types, which was invented about the year 1440, at *Mentz*, by JOHN GUTTEMBERG. By the ſuccours of this incomparable art the productions of the moſt eminent Greek and Latin writers, which had lain concealed, before this intereſting period, in the libraries of the monks, were now ſpred abroad with facility, and peruſed by many, who could never have had acceſs to them under their primitive form [p]. The peruſal of

---

[n] We have a full account of the obligations, which the republic of letters has to the family of Medicis in a valuable work of JOSEPH BIANCHINI DE PRATO, *Dei gran Duchi di Toſcana della neale Caſa de Medici, Protettori delle Lettere et delle Belle Arti, Ragionamenti Hiſtorici*, publiſhed in folio at *Venice* in 1741.

[o] See GIANNONE, *Hiſtoire Civile du Royaume de Naples*, tom. iii. p. 500. 628.—ANTON. PANORMITANI *Dicta et Facta memorabilia Alphonſi* I, *denuo Edita à* JO. GERH. MEUSCHENIO *Vit. Erud. Viror.* tom. ii. p. 1.

[(p) Dr. MOSHEIM decides here, that GUTTEMBERG of *Mentz* was the firſt inventor of the art of printing; but this notion is oppoſed with zeal by ſeveral men of learning. Among the theſe noble compoſitions purified the taſte, excited the emulation of men of genius, and animated them with a noble ambition of excelling in the ſame way [*q*].

The calamities of the Greeks conduces to the advancement of learning among the Latins.

II. The downfal of the Grecian empire contributed greatly to the propagation and advancement of learning in the weſt. For after the reduction of *Conſtantinople*, the moſt eminent of the Greek *Literati* paſſed into *Italy*, and were from thence diſperſed into the other countries of *Europe*, where, to gain a ſubſiſtence, theſe venerable exiles inſtructed every where the youth in Grecian erudition, and propagated throughout the weſtern world the love of learning, and a true and elegant taſte for the ſciences. Hence it was that every noted city and univerſity poſſeſſed one or more of theſe learned Greeks, who formed the ſtudious youth to literary purſuits [*r*]. But they received no where ſuch encouraging marks of protection and eſteem as in *Italy*, where they were honoured in a ſingular manner in various cities, and were more eſpecially diſtinguiſhed by the family of Medicis, whoſe liberality to the learned had no bounds. It was conſequently in *Italy*, that theſe ingenious fugitives were moſt numerous; and hence that country became, in ſome meaſure, the center of the arts and ſciences, and the general rendezvous of all who were ambitious of literary glory [*s*].

Philology, poetry, and languages cultivated.

III. The greateſt part of the learned men, who adorned, at this time, the various provinces of *Italy*, were principally employed in publiſhing accurate and elegant editions of the moſt eminent Greek and Latin authors, in illuſtrating theſe authors with uſeful commentaries, in ſtudying them as their models both in poetry and proſe, and in caſting light upon the precious remains of antiquity, that were diſcovered from day to day. In all theſe branches of literature many arrived at ſuch degrees of excellence, as it is almoſt impoſſible to ſurpaſs, and extremely difficult to equal. Nor were the other languages, and ſciences neglected. In the univerſity of *Paris*,

---

many treatiſes that have been publiſhed upon this ſubject, there is none compoſed with more erudition and judgment than that of profeſſor *Schoepflin* of *Straſbourg*, in which the very learned author undertakes to prove, that the art of printing, by the means of letters engraven on plates of wood, was invented at *Harlem* by COSTER; that the method of printing, by moveable types, was the diſcovery of JOHN GUTTEMBERG, a diſcovery made during his reſidence at *Straſbourg*; and that the ſtill more perfect manner of printing with types of metal caſt in a mould, was the contrivance of JOHN SCHOEFFER, and was firſt practiſed at *Mentz*. This learned work, in which the author examines the opinions of MARCHAND, FOURNIER, and other writers, was publiſhed in the year 1760, at *Straſbourg*, under the following title, JO. DANIELIS SCHOEPFLINI *Conſil. Reg. ac Franciæ Hiſtoriogr.* VINDICIÆ TYPOGRAPHICÆ, &c.]

[*q*] MICH. MATTAIRE, *Annales Typographici*.—PROSP. MARCHAND, *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie*, Haye 1740.

[*r*] JO. HENR. MAII *Vita Reuchlini*, p. 11. 13. 19. 28. 152, 153. 165.—CASP. BARTHIUS *ad Statium*, tom. ii. p. 1008.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad.* tom. v. p. 692.

[*s*] For a farther account of this intereſting period of the Hiſtory of Learning, the reader may conſult the learned Work of HUMPHR. HODY, *De Græcis illuſtribus litterarum inſtauratoribus*, publiſhed in 8vo at *London* in 1742, by Mr. SAMUEL JEBB; as alſo the moſt accurate and entertaining treatiſe of Mr. CHRISTIAN FREDERIC BÖRNER, *De doctis hominibus Græcis Litterarum Græcarum in Italia inſtauratoribus*, publiſhed in 8vo at *Leipſic* in the year 1750. To which may be added, SAM. BATTIERII *Oratio de inſtauratoribus Græcarum Litterarum*, publiſhed in the *Muſeum Helveticum*, tom. iv. p. 163.

there was now a public profeſſor not only of the Greek, but alſo of the Hebrew tongue [*t*]; and in *Spain* and *Italy* the ſtudy of that language, and of Oriental learning and antiquities in general, was purſued with the greateſt ſucceſs [*u*]. JOHN REUCHLINUS, otherwiſe called CAPNION, and TRITHEMIUS, who had made a vaſt progreſs both in the ſtudy of the languages and of the ſciences, were the reſtorers of ſolid learning among the *Germans* [*w*]; Latin poetry was revived by ANTONIUS PANORMITANUS, who excited a ſpirit of emulation among the favorites of the Muſes, and had many followers in that ſublime art [*x*]; while CYRIAC of *Ancona*, by his own example, introduced a taſte for coins, medals, inſcriptions, gems, and other precious monuments of antiquity, of which he himſelf made a large collection in *Italy* [*y*].

The ſtate of the Ariſtotelian and Platonic philoſophy.

IV. It is not neceſſary to give here a particular and minute account of the other branches of literature that flouriſhed in this century; nevertheleſs, the ſtate of philoſophy deſerves a moment's attention. Before the arrival of the Greeks in *Italy*, ARISTOTLE reigned unrivaled there, and captivated, as it were by a ſort of enchantment, all without exception, whoſe genius led them to philoſophical inquiries. The veneration that was ſhewn him degenerated into a fooliſh and extravagant enthuſiaſm; the encomiums with which he was loaded ſurpaſſed the bounds of decency; and many carried matters ſo far as to compare him with the reſpectable precurſor of the Meſſiah [*z*]. This violent paſſion for the Stagirite was, however, abated, or rather was rendered leſs univerſal, by the influence which the Grecian ſages, and particularly GEMISTIUS PLETHO acquired among the Latins, many of whom they perſuaded to abandon the contentious and ſubtile doctrine of the Peripatetics, and to ſubſtitute in its place the mild and divine wiſdom of PLATO. It was in the year 1439, about the time of the famous council of *Florence*, that this revolution happened in the empire of philoſophy. Several illuſtrious perſonages among the Latins, charmed with the ſublime ſentiments and doctrines of PLATO, had them propagated among the ſtudious youth, and particularly among thoſe of a certain rank and figure. The moſt eminent patron of this *divine* philoſophy, as it was termed by its votaries, was COSMO DE MEDICIS, who had no ſooner heard the lectures of PLETHO, than he formed the deſign of founding a Platonic academy at *Florence*. For this purpoſe he ordered MARSILIUS FICINUS, the ſon of his firſt phyſician, to be carefully inſtructed in the doctrines of the Athenian ſage, and, in general, in the language and philology of the Greeks, that he might tranſlate into Latin the productions of the moſt renowned Platoniſts. FICINUS anſwered well the expectations, and executed the intentions of his illuſtrious patron, by tranſlating ſucceſſively into the Latin language the celebrated works of HERMES TRISMEGISTUS, PLOTINUS, and PLATO. The ſame excellent prince encouraged by his munificence, and animated by his protection, many learned men, ſuch as AMBROSE of *Camaldoli*, LEONARDO BRUNO, POGGE, and others to undertake works of a like nature, even to enrich the Latin literature with tranſlations of the beſt Greek writers. The conſequence of all this was, that two philoſophical ſects aroſe in *Italy*, who debated for a long time (with the warmeſt animoſity in a multitude of learned and contentious productions) this important queſtion, which of the two was the greateſt philoſopher, ARISTOTLE or PLATO [*a*].

[*t*] R SIMON, *Critique de la Bibl. Eccleſ. par* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 502. 512.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Pariſ.* tom. v. p. 852.

[*u*] PAULI COLOMESII *Italia Orientalis*, p. 4. et *Hiſpania Orientalis*, p. 212.

[*w*] R. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies*, tom. i. p. 262. tom. iv. p. 131. 140.

[*x*] BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article PANORMIT.

[*y*] See the *Itinerarium* of CYRIAC of *Ancona*, publiſhed at *Florence* in the year 1742, in 8vo. by Mr. LAWRENCE MEHUS, from the original manuſcript, together with a Preface, Annotations, and ſeveral Letters of this learned man, who may be conſidered as the firſt antiquarian that appeared in *Europe*.—See alſo LEOHN. ARETINI *Epiſtolæ*, tom. ii. lib. ix. p. 149.

[*z*] See CHRIST. AUG. HEUMANNI *Acta Philoſophorum*, tom. iii. p. 345.

The Platonic Syncretiſts.

V. Between theſe two oppoſite factions certain eminent men, among both Greeks and Latins, thought proper to ſteer a middle courſe. To this claſs belong JOHANNES PICUS DE MIRANDOLA, BESSARION, HERMOLAUS BARBARUS, and others of leſs renown, who indeed conſidered PLATO as the ſupreme oracle of philoſophy, but would by no means ſuffer ARISTOTLE to be treated with indifference or contempt, and who propoſed to reconcile the jarring doctrines of theſe two famous Grecian ſages, and to combine them into one ſyſtem. Theſe moderate philoſophers, both in their manner of teaching and in the opinions they adopted, followed the modern Platonic ſchool, of which AMMONIUS was the original founder [*b*]. Their ſect was, for a long time, held in the utmoſt veneration, particularly among the Myſtics, while the ſcholaſtic doctors, and all ſuch as were infected with the itch of diſputing, favoured the Peripatetics. But after all, theſe reconciling Platoniſts were chargeable with many errors and follies; they fell into the moſt childiſh ſuperſtitions, and followed, without either reflexion or reſtraint, the extravagant dictates of their wanton imaginations.

The followers of Ariſtotle maintain their ſuperiority.

VI. Their ſyſtem of philoſophy, was, however, much leſs pernicious than that of the Ariſtotelians, their adverſaries, who ſtill maintained their ſuperiority in *Italy*, and inſtructed the youth in all the public ſchools of learning. For theſe ſubtile doctors, and more eſpecially the followers of AVERROES (who maintained that all the human race were animated by one common ſoul) ſapped imperceptibly the foundations of both natural and revealed religion, and entertained ſentiments very little, if at all, different from that impious pantheiſtical ſyſtem, which confounds the Deity with the univerſe, and acknowledges but one ſelf-exiſtent Being, compoſed of *infinite matter* and *infinite intelligence*. The moſt eminent among this claſs of ſophiſts was PETER POMPONACE, a native of *Mantua*, a man of a crafty turn, and an arrogant, enterprizing ſpirit, who, notwithſtanding the pernicious tendency of his writings (many of which are yet extant) to undermine the principles and to corrupt the doctrines of religion [c], was almoſt univerſally followed by all the profeſſors of philoſophy in the Italian academies. Theſe intricate doctors did not, however, eſcape the notice of the inquiſitors, who, alarmed both by the rapid progreſs and dangerous tendency of their metaphyſical notions, took cognizance of them, and called the Ariſtotelians to give an account of their principles. The latter, tempering their courage with craft, had recourſe to a mean and perfidious ſtratagem to extricate themſelves out of this embaraſſing trial. They pretended to eſtabliſh a wide diſtinction between philoſophical and theological truth, and, maintaining that their ſentiments were *philoſophically true* and conformable to right reaſon, they allowed them to be eſteemed *theologically falſe*, and contrary to the declarations of the Goſpel. This miſerable and impudent ſubterfuge was condemned and prohibited in the following century by LEO X, in a council held at the Lateran.

[*a*] BOIVIN, *Dans l'Hiſtoire de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. iv. p. 381.—LAUNOIUS, *De varia fortuna Ariſtotelis*, p. 225.—LEO ALLATIUS, *De Georgiis*, p. 391.—LA CROZE, *Entretiens ſur divers Sujets*. p. 384.—JOSEPH BIANCHINI, in his account of the protection granted to the learned by the houſe of *Medicis*, which we have mentioned note [*n*].—BRUCKERI *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iv. p. 62.

ſ(*a*) It was not only the reſpective merit of theſe two philoſophers, conſidered in that point of light, that was debated in this controverſy: The principal queſtion was, which of their ſyſtems was moſt conformable to the doctrines of Chriſtianity; and here the Platonic moſt certainly deſerved the preference, as was abundantly proved by PLETHO and others. It is well known, that many of the opinions of ARISTOTLE lead directly to atheiſm.]

[*b*] See BESSARION's Letter in the *Hiſtoire de l'Academie des Inſcriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. v. p. 456.—THOMASIUS, *De Syncretiſmo Peripatetico*, in *Orationibus* ejus, p. 340.

The controverſy between the Realiſts and Nominaliſts continued.

VII. The *Realiſts* and *Nominaliſts* continued their diſputes in *France* and *Germany* with more vigour and animoſity than ever, and, finding reaſon and argument, but feeble weapons, they had recourſe to mutual invectives and accuſations, penal laws, and even to the force of arms; a ſtrange method, ſurely, of deciding a metaphyſical queſtion. The conteſt was not only warm, but alſo univerſal in its extent, for it infected, almoſt without exception, all the *French* and *German* academies. In moſt places, however, the *Realiſts* maintained a manifeſt ſuperiority over the *Nominaliſts*, to whom they alſo gave the appellation of *Terminiſts* [d]. While the famous GERSON and the moſt eminent of his diſciples were living, the *Nominaliſts* were in high eſteem and credit in the univerſity of *Paris*. But upon the death of theſe powerful and reſpectable patrons, the face of things was entirely changed, and that much to their diſadvantage. In the year 1473, LEWIS XI, by the inſtigation of his confeſſor the biſhop of *Avranches*, iſſued out a ſevere edict againſt the doctrines of the *Nominaliſts*, and ordered all their writings to be ſeized, and ſecured in a ſort of impriſonment, that they might not be peruſed by the people [e]. But the ſame monarch mitigated this edict the year following, and permitted ſome of the books of that ſect to be delivered from their confinement [*f*]. In the year 1481, he went much farther; and not only granted a full liberty to the *Nominaliſts* and their writings, but alſo reſtored that philoſophical ſect to its former authority and luſtre in the univerſity [*g*].

---

[c] See the very learned BRUCKER's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iv. p. 158.

[d] See BRUCKER's *Hiſtoria Critica Philoſophiæ*, tom. iii. p. 904.—JO. SALABERTI *Philoſophia Nominalium Vindicata*, cap. i.—BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. iv. p. 531.—ARGENTRE, *Collectio documentor. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. p. 220.

[e] NAUDE's *Additions à l'Hiſtoire de Louis* XI, p. 203.—DU BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. v. 678. 705. 708.—LAUNOY's *Hiſtor. Gymnaſ. Navarr.* tom. iv. Opp. part. I. p. 201. 378.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the doctors and miniſters of the church, and its form of government, during this century.

The vices of the clergy.

I. THE moſt eminent writers of this century unanimouſly lament the miſerable condition to which the Chriſtian church was reduced by the corruption of its miniſters, and which ſeemed to portend nothing leſs than its total ruin, if providence did not interpoſe, by extraordinary means, for its deliverance and preſervation. The vices that reigned among the Roman pontifs, and, indeed, among all the eccleſiaſtical order were ſo flagrant, that the complaints of theſe good men did not appear, at all, exaggerated, or their apprehenſions ill-founded; nor had any of the corrupt advocates of the clergy the courage to call them to an account for the ſharpneſs of their cenſures and of their complaints. Nay, the more eminent rulers of the church, who lived in a luxurious indolence and in the infamous practice of all kinds of vice, were obliged to hear with a placid countenance and even to commend theſe bold cenſors who declaimed againſt the degeneracy of the church, declared that there was almoſt nothing ſound either in its viſible head, or in its members, and demanded the aid of the ſecular arm and the deſtroying ſword to lopp off the parts that were infected with this grievous and deplorable contagion. Things, in ſhort, were brought to ſuch a paſs, that they were deemed the beſt Chriſtians, and the moſt uſeful members of ſociety, who, braving the terrors of perſecution, and triumphing over the fear of man, inveighed with the greateſt freedom and fervor againſt the court of *Rome*, its lordly pontif, and the whole tribe of his followers and votaries.

The great weſtern ſchiſm fomented and continued.

II. At the commencement of this century the Latin church was divided into two great factions, and was governed by two contending pontifs, BONIFACE IX, who remained at *Rome*, and BENEDICT XIII, who reſided at *Avignon*. Upon the death of the former the *Cardinals* of his party raiſed to the pontificate, in the year 1404, COSMAT DE MELIORATI, who aſſumed the name of INNOCENT VII [*h*], and held that high dignity during the ſhort ſpace of two years only. After his deceaſe ANGELI CORRARIO, a Venetian cardinal, was choſen in his room, and ruled the Roman faction under the title of GREGORY XII. A plan of reconciliation was however formed, and the contending pontifs bound themſelves, each by an oath, to make a voluntary renunciation of the papal chair, if that ſtep were neceſſary to promote the peace and welfare of the church; but they both violated this ſolemn obligation in a ſcandalous manner. BENEDICT XIII, beſieged in *Avignon* by the king of *France*, in the year 1408, ſaved himſelf by flight, retiring firſt into *Catalonia*, his native country, and afterwards to *Perpignan*. Hence eight or nine of the cardinals, who adhered to his cauſe, ſeeing themſelves deſerted by their pope, went over to the other ſide, and, joining publicly with the cardinals of GREGORY XII, they agreed together to aſſemble a council at *Piſa* on the 25th of March, 1409, in order to heal the diviſions and factions that had ſo long rent the papal empire. This council, however, which was deſigned to cloſe the wounds of the church, had an effect quite contrary to that which was univerſally expected, and only ſerved to open a new breach, and to excite new diviſions. Its proceedings, indeed, were vigorous, and its meaſures were accompanied with a juſt ſeverity. A heavy ſentence of condemnation was pronounced the 5th day of June, againſt the contending pontifs, who were both declared guilty of hereſy, perjury, and contumacy, unworthy of the ſmalleſt tokens of honour or reſpect, and ſeparated *ipſo facto* from the communion of the church. This ſtep was followed by the election of *one* pontif in their place. The election was made on the 25th of June, and fell upon PETER OF CANDIA, known in the papal liſt by the name of ALEXANDER V [i]; but all the decrees and proceedings of this famous council were treated with contempt by the condemned pontifs, who continued to enjoy the privileges and to perform the functions of the papacy, as if no attempts had been made to remove them from that dignity. BENEDICT aſſembled a council at *Perpignan*; and GREGORY, another at *Auſtria* near *Aquileia*, in the diſtrict of *Friuli*. The latter, however, apprehending the reſentment of the Venetians [k], made his eſcape in a clandeſtine manner from the territory of *Aquileia*, arrived at *Caieta*, where he threw himſelf upon the protection of LADISLAUS, king of *Naples*, and, in the year 1412, fled from thence to *Rimini*.

[*f*] BOULAY *loc. cit.* tom. v. p 710.

[*g*] The proofs of this we find in SALABERT's *Philoſophia Nominal. Vindicata*, cap. i. p. 104. —See alſo BOULAY *loc. cit.* tom. v. p. 739. 747.

[*h*] Beſides the ordinary writers, who have given us an account of the tranſactions that happened under the pontificate of INNOCENT VII, ſee LEON. ARETIN. *Epiſtol.* lib. i. ep. iv, v. p. 6. 19. 21. lib. ii. p. 30. et COLLUC. SALUTAT. *Epiſtol.* lib. ii. ep. i. p. 1. 18. ed. *Florent.*—We have alſo an account of the pontificate of GREGORY, in the *Epiſtles* of the ſame ARETIN, lib. ii, iii. p. 32. ep. vii. p. 39. 41. 51. lib. ii. ep. xvii. p. 54. 56. 59.—JO. LAMI *Deliciæ Eruditorum*, tom. x. p. 494.

The council of *Conſtance* aſſembled by the emperor Sigiſmond.

III. Thus was the Chriſtian church divided into three great factions, and its government violently carried on by three contending chiefs, who loaded each other with reciprocal maledictions, calumnies, and excommunications. ALEXANDER V, who had been elected pontif at the council of *Piſa*, died at *Bologna* in the year 1410; and the ſixteen cardinals, who attended him in that city, immediately filled up the vacancy by chooſing as his ſucceſſor BALTHASAR COSSA, a Neapolitan, who was deſtitute of all principles both of religion and probity, and who aſſumed the title of JOHN XXIII. The duration of this ſchiſm in the papacy was a ſource of many calamities, and became daily more detrimental both to the civil and religious intereſts of thoſe nations, where the flame raged. Hence it was, that the emperor SIGISMUND, the king of *France*, and ſeveral other European princes employed all their zeal and activity, and ſpared neither labour nor expence, in reſtoring the tranquillity of the church, and uniting it again under one ſpiritual head. On the other hand, the pontifs could not be perſuaded by any means to prefer the peace of the church to the gratification of their ambition; ſo that no other poſſible method of accommodating this weighty matter remained, than the aſſembling of a general council, in which the controverſy might be examined and terminated by the judgment and deciſion of the univerſal church. This council was accordingly ſummoned to meet at *Conſtance*, in the year 1414, by JOHN XXIII, who was engaged in this meaſure by the entreaties of SIGISMUND, and alſo from an expectation that the decrees of this grand aſſembly would be favorable to his intereſts. He appeared in perſon, attended with a great number of cardinals and biſhops, at this famous council, which was alſo honoured with the preſence of the emperor SIGISMUND, and of a great number of German princes, and with that of the ambaſſadors of all the European ſtates, whoſe monarchs or regents could not be perſonally preſent at the deciſion of this important controverſy [*l*].

---

[i] See LENFANT's *Hiſtoire du Concile de Piſe*, publiſhed in 4to at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1724. —FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Romanor.* tom. iv. p. 350.—BOSSUET, *Defenſio Decreti Gallicani de Poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica*, tom. ii. p. 17, &c.

[(k) He had offended the Venetians by depoſing their patriarch ANTONY PANCIARINI, and putting ANTHONY DU PONT, the biſhop of *Concordia*, in his place.]

The deſign and iſſue of this grand council.

IV. The great purpoſe, that was aimed at in the convocation of this grand aſſembly, was the healing of the ſchiſm that had ſo long rent the papacy; and this purpoſe was happily accompliſhed. It was ſolemnly declared in the IV and V ſeſſions of this council, by two decrees that the Roman pontif was inferior and ſubject to a general aſſembly of the univerſal church, and the authority of councils was vindicated and maintained, in the ſame decrees, in the moſt effectual manner [*m*]. This vigorous proceeding prepared the way for the degradation of JOHN XXIII, who, during the XII ſeſſion, was unanimouſly depoſed from the pontificate [*n*] on account of ſeveral flagitious crimes that were laid to his charge, and more eſpecially on account of the ſcandalous violation of a ſolemn engagement, he had taken about the beginning of the council, to reſign the papal chair, if that meaſure ſhould appear neceſſary to the peace of the church; which engagement he broke ſome weeks after by a clandeſtine flight. In this ſame year (1415), GREGORY XII ſent to the council CHARLES DE MALATESTA to make, in his name, and as his proxy, a ſolemn and voluntary reſignation of the pontificate. About two years after this, BENEDICT XIII was depoſed by a ſolemn reſolution of the council [*o*], and OTTO DE COLONNA raiſed, by the unanimous ſuffrages of the cardinals, to the high dignity of head of the church, which he ruled under the title of MARTIN V. BENEDICT, who reſided ſtill at *Perpignan*, was far from being diſpoſed to ſubmit either to the decree of the council, which depoſed him, or to the determination of the cardinals with reſpect to his ſucceſſor. On the contrary, he perſiſted until the day of his death, which happened in the year 1423, in aſſuming the title, the prerogatives, and the authority of the papacy. And when this obſtinate man was dead, a certain Spaniard, named GILES MUNIOS, was choſen pope in his place by two cardinals, under the auſpicious patronage of ALPHONSUS, king of *Sicily*, and adopted the title of CLEMENT VIII; but this ſorry pontif, in the year 1429, was perſuaded to reſign his pretenſions to the papacy, and to leave the government of the church to MARTIN V.

[*l*] The *Acts* of this famous council were publiſhed in ſix volumes in folio, at *Francfort*, in the year 1700, by HERMAN von der HARDT. This collection, however, is imperfect, notwithſtanding the pains that it coſt the laborious editor. Many of the *Acts* are omitted, and a great number of pieces ſtuffed in among the *Acts*, which by no means deſerve a place there. The hiſtory of this council by LENFANT is compoſed with great accuracy and elegance. It appeared in a ſecond edition at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1728, in two volumes, quarto, the firſt was publiſhed in 1714. The Supplement that was given to this hiſtory by BOURGEOIS DE CHASTENET, a French lawyer, is but an indifferent performance. It is entitled *Nouvelle Hiſtoire du Concile de Conſtance, où l'on fait voir combien la France a contribué à l'extinction du Schiſme.*

[*m*] For an account of theſe two famous decrees, which ſet ſuch wiſe limits to the ſupremacy of the pontifs, ſee NATALIS ALEXAND. *Hiſt. Eccl. Sæc.* XV. *Diſſ.* iv.—BOSSUET, *Defenſ. Sententiæ Cleri Gallican. de Poteſt. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. ii. p. 2. 23.—LENFANT, *Diſſert. Hiſtorique et Apologetique pour Jean Gerſon, et le Concile de Conſtance*, which is ſubjoined to his hiſtory of that council.

[*n*] On the 29th of May, 1415.

John Huſs.

V. If from the meaſures, that were taken in this council to check the lordly arrogance of the Roman pontifs, we turn our eyes to the proceedings that were carried on againſt thoſe that were called *heretics*, we ſhall obſerve in this new ſcene nothing worthy of applauſe, but ſeveral things on the contrary that are proper to excite our indignation, and which no pretext, no conſideration can render excuſable. Before the meeting of this council, there were great commotions raiſed in ſeveral parts of *Europe*, and more eſpecially in *Bohemia*, concerning religious matters. One of the perſons that gave occaſion to theſe diſputes was JOHN HUSS, who lived at *Prague* in the higheſt reputation, both on account of the ſanctity of his manners and the purity of his doctrine, who was diſtinguiſhed by his uncommon erudition and eloquence, and who performed, at the ſame time, the functions of profeſſor of divinity in the univerſity, and of ordinary paſtor in the church of that famous city [*p*]. This eminent eccleſiaſtic declaimed with vehemence againſt the vices that had corrupted all the different ranks and orders of the clergy, nor was he ſingular in this reſpect; ſuch remonſtrances were become very common, and they were generally approved of by the wiſe and good. HUSS, however, went ſtill farther; and, from the year 1408, uſed his moſt earneſt and aſſiduous endeavours to withdraw the univerſity of *Prague* from the juriſdiction of GREGORY XII, whom the kingdom of *Bohemia* had hitherto acknowledged as the true and lawful head of the church. The archbiſhop of *Prague*, and the clergy in general, who were warmly attached to the intereſts of GREGORY, were greatly exaſperated at theſe proceedings. Hence aroſe a violent quarrel between the incenſed prelate and the zealous reformer, which the latter inflamed and augmented, from day to day, by his pathetic exclamations againſt the court of *Rome*, and the corruptions, that prevailed among the Sacerdotal order.

[*o*] On the 26th of July, 1417.

[(*p*) A Bohemian jeſuit, who was far from being favorable to JOHN HUSS, and who had the beſt opportunity of being acquainted with his real character, deſcribes him thus: *He was more ſubtile, than eloquent; but the gravity and auſterity of his manners, his frugal and exemplary life, his pale and meagre countenance, his ſweetneſs of temper, and his uncommon affability towards perſons of all ranks and conditions, from the higheſt to the loweſt, were much more perſuaſive, than any eloquence could be.* See BOHUS. BALBINUS, *Epitom. Rer. Bohem.* lib. iv. cap. v. p. 431.]

The reaſons that excited the reſentment of the clergy againſt John Huſs.

VI. Such were the circumſtances that firſt excited the reſentment of the clergy againſt JOHN HUSS. This reſentment, however, might have been eaſily calmed and perhaps totally extinguiſhed, if new incidents of a more important kind had not aroſe to keep up the flame, and increaſe its fury. In the firſt place, he adopted the philoſophical opinions of the *Realiſts*, and ſhewed his warm attachment to their cauſe in the manner, that was uſual in this barbarous age, even by perſecuting to the utmoſt of his power their adverſaries the *Nominaliſts*, whoſe number was great, and whoſe influence was conſiderable in the univerſity of *Prague* [q]. He alſo multiplied the number of his enemies in the year 1408, by procuring, through his great credit, a ſentence in favour of the Bohemians, who diſputed with the Germans concerning the number of ſuffrages, that their reſpective nations were entitled to in all matters that were carried by election in the univerſity of *Prague*. That the nature of this conteſt may be better underſtood, it will be proper to obſerve, that this famous univerſity was divided, by its founder CHARLES IV, into four nations, to wit, the Bohemians, Bavarians, Poles, and Saxons, of which, according to the original laws of the univerſity, the firſt had *three ſuffrages*; and the other three, who were comprehended under the title of the *German nation*, only *one*. This arrangement, however, had not only been altered by cuſtom, but was entirely inverted in favour of the Germans, who were vaſtly ſuperior to the Bohemians in number, and aſſumed to themſelves the three ſuffrages, which, according to the original inſtitution of the univerſity, belonged, undoubtedly, to the latter. HUSS therefore, whether animated by a principle of patriotiſm, or by an averſion to the *Nominaliſts*, who were peculiarly favoured by the Germans, raiſed his voice againſt this abuſe, and employed, with ſucceſs, the extraordinary credit, he had obtained at court, by his flowing and maſculine elequence, in depriving the Germans of the privilege they had uſurped, and in reducing their three ſuffrages to one. The iſſue of this long and tedious conteſt [r] was ſo offenſive to the Germans, that a prodigious number of them, with JOHN HOFFMAN the rector of the univerſity at their head [s], retired from *Prague*, and repaired to *Leipſick*, where FREDERIC, ſurnamed the *Wiſe*, elector of *Saxony*, erected for them, in the year 1409, the famous academy which ſtill ſubſiſts in a flouriſhing ſtate. This event contributed greatly to render HUSS odious to many, and, by the conſequences that followed it, was certainly inſtrumental in bringing on his ruin. For no ſooner had the Germans retired from *Prague*, than he began, not only to inveigh with greater freedom than he had formerly done againſt the vices and corruptions of the clergy, but even went ſo far as to recommend, in an open and public manner, the writings and opinions of the famous WICKLIFF, whoſe new doctrines had already made ſuch a noiſe in *England*. Hence an accuſation was brought againſt him, in the year 1410, before the tribunal of JOHN XXIII, by whom he was ſolemnly expelled from the communion of the church. He treated, indeed, this communication with the utmoſt contempt, and, both in his converſation and in his writings, laid open the diſorders that preyed upon the vitals of the church, and the vices that diſhonoured the conduct of its miniſters [t], and the fortitude and zeal he diſcovered in this matter were almoſt univerſally applauded.

---

[q] See the *Litteræ Nominalium ad Regem Franciæ Ludovicum* VI, in BALUZII *Miſcellan.* tom. iv. p. 534. where we read the following paſſage: *Legimus Nominales expulſos de Bohemia eo tempore, quo hæretici voluerunt Bohemicum Regnum ſuis hæreſibus inficere.—Quum dicti hæretici non poſſent diſputando ſuperare impetraverunt ab Abbiſſeſlao* (Wenceſlao) *Principe Bohemiæ, ut gubernarentur ſtudia Pragenſia ritu Pariſienſium. Quo edicto coacti ſunt ſupradicti Nominales Pragam civitatem relinquere, et ſe tranſtulerunt ad Lipzicam civitatem et ibidem erexerunt univerſitatem ſolemniſſimam.*

[(r) WENCESLAUS, king of *Bohemia*, who was bribed by both of the contending parties, protracted inſtead of abridging this diſpute, and uſed to ſay with a ſmile, that he had found a good *gooſe*, which *laid every day a conſiderable number of gold and ſilver eggs*. This was playing upon the word *Huſs*, which, in the German language, ſignifies a *gooſe*.]

[(s) Hiſtorians differ much in their accounts of the number of Germans that retired from the univerſity of *Prague* upon this occaſion. *Æneas Sylvius* reckons 5000, *Trithemius* and others 2000, *Dubravius* 24,000, *Lupacius* 44,000, *Lauda*, a contemporary writer, 36,000.]

John Huſs is burned alive.

VII. This eminent man, whoſe piety was truly fervent and ſincere, though his zeal perhaps was rather too violent, and his prudence not always equally conſummate, was ſummoned to appear before the council of *Conſtance*. Obedient to this order, and thinking himſelf ſecured from the rage of his enemies by the ſafe-conduct, which had been granted him by the emperor SIGISMUND, both for his journey to *Conſtance*, his reſidence in that place, and his return to his own country, JOHN HUSS appeared before the council to demonſtrate his innocence, and to prove that the charge of his having deſerted the church of *Rome* was entirely groundleſs. And it may be affirmed with truth, that his religious opinions, at leaſt in matters of moment and importance, were conformable to the eſtabliſhed doctrine of the church in this age [u]. He declaimed, indeed, with extraordinary vehemence againſt the Roman pontifs, the biſhops and monks; but this freedom was looked upon as lawful in theſe times, and it was uſed every day in the council of *Conſtance*, where the tyranny of the court of *Rome*, and the corruption of the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders were cenſured with the utmoſt ſeverity. The enemies, however, of this good man, who were very numerous both in the kingdom of *Bohemia* and alſo in the council of *Conſtance*, coloured the accuſation that was brought againſt him, with ſuch artifice and ſucceſs, that, by the moſt ſcandalous breach of public faith, he was caſt into priſon, declared a heretic, becauſe he refuſed to obey the order of the council in pleading guilty againſt the dictates of his conſcience, and was burnt alive the 6th of July, 1415, which dreadful puniſhment he endured with unparalleled magnanimity and reſignation, expreſſing in his laſt moments the nobleſt feelings of love to God, and the moſt triumphant hope of the accompliſhment of thoſe tranſporting promiſes with which the Goſpel arms the true Chriſtian at the approach of eternity. The ſame unhappy fate was borne with the ſame pious fortitude and conſtancy of mind by JEROM of *Prague*, the intimate companion of JOHN HUSS, who came to this council with the generous deſign of ſupporting and ſeconding his perſecuted friend. Terrified by the proſpect of a cruel death, JEROME at firſt appeared willing to ſubmit to the orders of the council, and to abandon the tenets and opinions which it had condemned in his writings. This ſubmiſſion, however, was not attended with the advantages he expected from it, nor did it deliver him from the cloſe and ſevere confinement in which he was kept. He therefore reſumed his fortitude, profeſſed anew, with an heroic conſtancy, the opinions, which he had deſerted for a while from a principle of fear, and maintained them in the flames in which he expired on the 30h of May, 1416 [*w*].

---

[t] See LAUR. BYZINII *Diarium Belli Huſſitici*, in LUDWIG's *Reliquiæ Manuſcriptorum*, tom. vi. p. 127.

[(u) It was obſerved in the preceding ſection, that JOHN HUSS adopted with zeal, and recommended in an open and public manner, the writings and opinions of WICKLIFF; but this muſt be underſtood of the writings and opinions of that great man in relation to the papal hierarchy, the deſpotiſm of the court of *Rome*, and the corruption of the clergy; for in other reſpects, it is certain that he adhered to the moſt ſuperſtitious doctrines of the church, as appears by two Sermons he had prepared for the council of *Conſtance*.]

The true cauſes of theſe violent proceedings againſt John Huſs and Jerom of *Prague*.

Many learned men have endeavoured to inveſtigate the reaſons that occaſioned the pronouncing ſuch a cruel ſentence againſt HUSS and his aſſociate; and as no adequate reaſons for ſuch a ſevere proceeding can be found, either in the life or opinions of that good man, they conclude, that he fell a victim to the rage and injuſtice of his unrelenting enemies. And indeed this concluſion is both natural and well-grounded; nor will it be difficult to ſhew how it came to paſs, that the reverend fathers of the council of *Conſtance* were ſo eagerly bent to ſtigmatize and burn as a heretic, a man who neither deſerved ſuch an injurious title, nor ſuch a dreadful fate. In the *firſt place*, JOHN HUSS had excited, both by his diſcourſe and by his writings, great commotions in *Bohemia*, and had rendered the clergy of all ranks and orders extremely odious in the eyes of the people. The biſhops, therefore, together with the ſacerdotal and monaſtic orders, were very ſenſible, that their honours and advantages, their credit and authority, were in the greateſt danger of being reduced to nothing, if this reformer ſhould return again to his country, and continue to write and declaim againſt the clergy with the ſame freedom that he had formerly done. Hence they left no means unemployed to accompliſh his ruin; they laboured night and day, they formed plots, they bribed men in power, they uſed, in ſhort, every method that could have any tendency to rid them of ſuch a formidable adverſary [*x*]. We obſerve, *ſecondly*, that, in the council

---

[(*w*) The tranſlator has here inſerted into the text the large note [*a*] of the original, which relates to the circumſtances that precipitated the ruin of theſe two eminent reformers; and he has thrown the citations therein contained into ſeveral notes.]

[*x*] The bribery and corruption that was employed in bringing about the ruin of JOHN HUSS, are manifeſt from the following remarkable paſſages of the *Diarium* HUSSITICUM of LAUR. BYZINIUS, p. 135. (ſee LUDEWIGI *Reliquiæ*, tom. vi.) *Clerus perverſus præcipue in regno Bohemiæ et Marchionatu Moraviæ condemnationem ipſius* (Huſſi) CONTRIBUTIONE PECUNIARUM, *et modis aliis diverſis procuravit et ad ipſius conſenſit interitum.* And again, p. 150. *Clerus perverſus regni Bohemiæ et Marchionatus Moraviæ, et præcipue Epiſcopi, Abbates, Canonici, plebani et religioſi ipſius fideles ac ſalutiferas admonitiones, adhortationes, ipſorum pompam, ſymoniam, avaritiam, fornicationem, vitæque deteſtandæ abominationem detegentes, ferre non valendo,* PECUNIARUM CONTRIBUTIONE *ad ipſius extinctionem faciendo procurarunt.*

of *Conſtance*, there were many men of great influence and weight, who looked upon themſelves as perſonally offended by JOHN HUSS, and who demanded his life as the only ſacrifice that could ſatisfy their vengeance. HUSS, as has been already mentioned, was not only attached to the party of the *Realiſts*, but was peculiarly ſevere in his oppoſition to their adverſaries. And now he was ſo unhappy as to be brought before a tribunal which was principally compoſed of the *Nominaliſts*, with the famous JOHN GERSON at their head, who was the zealous patron of that faction, and the mortal enemy of HUSS. Nothing could equal the vindictive pleaſure the *Nominaliſts* felt from an event that put this unfortunate priſoner in their power, and gave them an opportunity of ſatisfying their vengeance to the full; and accordingly, in their *Letter* to LEWIS, king of *France* [y], they don't pretend to deny that HUSS fell a victim to the reſentment of their ſect, which is alſo confirmed by the hiſtory of the council of *Conſtance*. The animoſities that always reigned among the *Realiſts* and *Nominaliſts* were at this time carried to the greateſt exceſs imaginable. Upon every occaſion that offered, they accuſed each other of hereſy and impiety, and had conſtantly recourſe to corporal puniſhments to decide the matter. The *Nominaliſts* procured the death of HUSS, who was a *Realiſt*; and the *Realiſts*, on the other hand, obtained, in the year 1479, the condemnation of JOHN DE WESALIA, who was attached to the party of the *Nominaliſts* [z]. Theſe contending ſects carried their blind fury ſo far as to charge each other with the ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt [a], and exhibited the moſt miſerable ſpectacle of inhuman bigottry to the Chriſtian world. The averſion which JOHN HUSS and JEROM, his companion, had againſt the Germans was a *third* circumſtance that contributed to determine their unhappy fate. This averſion they declared publicly at *Prague*, upon all occaſions both by their words and actions; nor were they at any pains to conceal it even in the council of *Conſtance*, where they accuſed them of preſumption and deſpotiſm in the ſtrongeſt terms [b]. The Germans, on the other hand, remembring the affront they had received in the univerſity of *Prague* by the means of John Huss, burned with reſentment and rage both againſt him and his unfortunate friend; and as their influence and authority were very great in the council, there is no doubt that they employed them, with the utmoſt zeal, againſt theſe two formidable adverſaries. Beſides; John Hoffman, the famous rector of the univerſity of *Prague*, whom Huss had been the occaſion of expelling from that city together with the Germans, and who was in conſequence thereof become his moſt virulent enemy, was conſecrated biſhop of *Miſnia* in the year 1413, and held in this council the moſt illuſtrious rank among the delegates of the German church. This circumſtance was alſo moſt unfavourable to Huss, and was, no doubt, in the event detrimental to his cauſe.

---

[y] See BALUZII *Miſcell.* tom. iv. p. 534. in which we find the following paſſage: *Suſcitavit Deus doctores catholicos, Petrum de Allyaco, Johannem de Gerſono, et alios quam plures doctiſſimos homines Nominales, qui convocati ad Concilium Conſtantienſe, ad quod citati fuerunt hæretici et nominatim Hieronymus et Johannes — dictos hæreticos per quadraginta dies diſputando ſuperaverant.*

[z] See the *Examen Magiſtrale et Theologicale Mag. Joh. de Weſalia*, in ORTUINI GRATII *Faſciculo rerum Expetend. et fugiendar. Colon.* 1535. *Fol.* clxiii.

[a] In the *Examen* mentioned in the preceding note, we find the following ſtriking paſſage, which may ſhew us the extravagant length to which the diſputes between the *Nominaliſts* and *Realiſts* were now carried: *Quis niſi ipſe Diabolus ſeminavit illam zizaniam inter Philoſophos et inter Theologos, ut tanta ſit diſſenſio,* etiam animorum *inter diverſa opinantes? Adeo ut ſi univerſalia quiſquam Realia negaverit, exiſtimetur* IN SPIRITUM SANCTUM PECCAVISSE, *immo ſummo et maximo peccato plenus creditur contra Deum, contra Chriſtianam religionem, contra juſtitiam, contra omnem politiam graviter deliquiſſe. Unde hæc cæcitas mentis niſi a Diabolo, qui phantaſias noſtras illudit?* We ſee by this paſſage that the *Realiſts* charged their adverſaries (whoſe only crime was the abſurdity of calling *univerſal ideas* mere *denominations*) with ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt, with tranſgreſſion againſt God, and againſt the Chriſtian religion, and with a violation of all the laws of juſtice and civil polity.

[b] See THEOD. DE NIEM, *Invectiva in Joh.* XXIII, in HARDTII *Actis Concilii Conſtant.* tom. ii. p. 450. *Improperabat etiam in publico Alamannis, dicendo, quod eſſent præſumptuoſi et vellent ubique per*

The circumſtances now mentioned as contributing to the unhappy fate of this good man, are, as we ſee, all drawn from the reſentment and prejudices of his enemies, and have not the leaſt colour of equity. It muſt, however, be confeſſed, that there appeared one *mark* of *hereſy* in the conduct of this reformer, which, according to the notions that prevailed in this century, might expoſe him to condemnation with ſome ſhadow of reaſon and juſtice; I mean, his inflexible obſtinacy, which the church of *Rome* always conſidered as a grievous *hereſy* even in thoſe whoſe errors were of little moment. We muſt conſider this man, as called before a council, which was ſuppoſed to repreſent the univerſal church, to confeſs his faults and to abjure his errors. This he obſtinately refuſed to do, unleſs he was previouſly convicted of error; here therefore he reſiſted the authority of the *catholic church*, demanded a rational proof of the juſtice of the ſentence it had pronounced againſt him, and intimated, with ſufficient plainneſs, that he looked upon the church as *fallible*. All this certainly was moſt enormouſly criminal and intolerably heretical, according to the general opinion of the times. For it became a *dutiful* ſon of the church to renounce his eye-ſight and to ſubmit both his judgment and his will, without any exception or reſervation to the judgment and will of that holy mother, under a firm belief and entire perſuaſion of the infallibility of all her deciſions. This ghoſtly mother had, for many ages paſt, followed, whenever her unerring perfection and authority were called in queſtion, the rule which Pliny obſerved in his conduct towards the Chriſtians. "When they perſevered, *ſays he in his letter to* "Trajan [c], I put my threats into execution, from a perſuaſion that "whatever their confeſſion might be, their audacious and invincible obſti"nacy deſerved an exemplary puniſhment."

The council iſſue out a decree againſt the writings and aſhes of Wickliff.

VIII. Before ſentence had been pronounced againſt John Huss and Jerome of *Prague*, the famous Wickliff, whoſe opinions they were ſuppoſed to adopt, and who was long ſince dead, was called from his reſt before

---

orbem dominari . . . Sicque factum fuiſſet ſæpe in Bohemia, ubi volentes etiam dominari Alamanni VIOLENTER *exinde* REPULSI *et* MALE TRACTATI *fuiſſent.*

[c] Plin. *Epiſt.* lib. x. ep. 97. *Perſeverantes duci juſſi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecumque eſſet, quod faterentur, pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obſtinationem debere puniri.*

this ghoſtly tribunal, and his memory was ſolemnly branded with infamy by a decree of the council. On the 4th day of May, in the year 1415, a long liſt of propoſitions, invidiouſly culled out of his writings, was examined and condemned, and an order was iſſued out to commit all his works, together with his bones, to the flames. On the 14th of June following, the aſſembled fathers paſſed the famous decree, which took the *cup* from the laity in the celebration of the eucharist, ordered *that the Lord's ſupper ſhould be received by them only in one kind*, i. e. *the bread*, and rigorouſly prohibited the *communion in both kinds*. This decree was occaſioned by complaints that had been made of the conduct of Jacobellus de Misa, curate of the pariſh of *St. Michael* at *Prague*, who, about a year before this, had been perſuaded by Peter of *Dreſden*, to adminiſter the Lord's ſupper in *both kinds*, and was followed in this by ſeveral churches [d]. The council, being informed of this matter by a certain Bohemian biſhop, thought proper to oppoſe, with vigour, the progreſs of this *hereſy*; and therefore they enacted the ſtatute, which ordered the *communion to be adminiſtred to the laity but in one kind*, and which obtained the force and authority of a law in the church of *Rome*.

The ſentence of the council againſt John Petit.

IX. In the ſame year, the opinion of John Petit, a doctor of divinity at *Paris* [e], who maintained, that every individual had an undoubted right to take away the life of a tyrant, was brought before the council, and was condemned as an odious and deteſtable hereſy; but both the name and perſon of the author were ſpared on account of the powerful patrons, under whoſe protection he had defended that pernicious doctrine. John, duke of *Burgundy*, had, in the year 1407, employed a band of ruffians to aſſaſſinate Lewis, duke of *Orleans*, only brother of Charles VI, king of *France*. While the whole city of *Paris* was in an uproar in conſequence of this horrible deed, Petit juſtified it in a public oration in preſence of the Dauphin and the princes of the blood, affirming, that the duke had done a laudable action, and that it was lawful to put a tyrant to death, *in any way*, *either by violence*, *or fraud*, *and without any form of law or juſtice*; *nay*, *even in oppoſition to the moſt ſolemn contracts and oaths of fidelity and allegiance*. It is, however, to be obſerved, that by *tyrants* this doctor did not mean the ſupreme rulers of nations, but thoſe more powerful and inſolent ſubjects, who abuſed their wealth and credit to bring about meaſures that tended to the diſhonour of their ſovereign and the ruin of their country [f]. The univerſity of *Paris* pronounced a ſevere and rigorous ſentence againſt the author of this pernicious opinion, and the council of *Conſtance*, after much deliberation and debate, condemned the opinion without mentioning the author. This determination of the council, though modified with the utmoſt clemency and mildneſs, was not ratified by the new pontif MARTIN V, who dreaded too much the formidable power of the duke of *Burgundy* to confirm a ſentence which he knew would be diſpleaſing to that ambitious prince [g].

---

[d] Byzena *Diarium Huſſiticum*, p. 124.

[(e) Some hiſtorians have erroneouſly repreſented Petit as a lawyer. See Dr. Smollet's *Hiſtory of England*, vol. ii. p. 462. in 4to.]

[f] This appears manifeſtly from the very diſcourſe of Petit, which the reader may ſee in Lenfant's *Hiſtory of the Council of Piſa*, tom. ii. p. 303*. See alſo August. Leyseri *Diſſ. qua memoriam Joh. Burgundi et doctrinam Joh. Parvi de cæde perduellium vindicat.* Witteberg. 1735, in 4to.

[* See alſo the ſame author's *Hiſtory of the Council of Conſtance*, Book iii. § xix.].

The hopes of a reformation in the church fruſtrated.

X. After theſe and other tranſactions of a like nature, it was now time to take into conſideration a point of more importance than had yet been propoſed, even the reformation of the church in its *head* and in its *members*, by ſetting bounds to the deſpotiſm and corruption of the Roman pontifs, and to the luxury and immorality of a licentious clergy. It was particularly with a view to this important object, that the eyes of all *Europe* were fixed upon the council of *Conſtance*, from a univerſal perſuaſion of the neceſſity of this reformation, and an ardent deſire of ſeeing it happily brought into execution. Nor did the council itſelf deny, that this reformation was the principal end of their meeting. Yet this ſalutary work had ſo many obſtacles in the paſſions and intereſts of thoſe very perſons by whom it was to be effected, that little could be expected, and ſtill leſs was done. The cardinals and dignified clergy, whoſe intereſt it was that the church ſhould remain in its corrupt and diſordered ſtate, employed all their eloquence and art to prevent its reformation; and obſerved, among other artful pretexts, that a work of ſuch high moment and importance could not be undertaken with any proſpect of ſucceſs, until a new pontif was elected. And, what was ſtill more ſhocking, the new pontif MARTIN V was no ſooner raiſed to that high dignity, than he employed his authority to elude and fruſtrate every effort that was made to ſet this ſalutary work on foot; and made it appear moſt evidently by the laws he enacted, that nothing was more foreign from his intention than the reformation of the clergy, and the reſtoration of the church to its primitive purity. Thus this famous council, after ſitting three years and ſix months, was diſſolved on the 22d day of April, 1418, without having effected what was the chief deſign of their aſſembling; and put off to a future aſſembly of the ſame kind, which was to be ſummoned five years after this period, that pious deſign of purifying a corrupt church, which had been ſo long the object of the expectations and deſires of all good Chriſtians.

A council aſſembled at *Baſil*, where the reformation of the church is again attempted in vain.

X. Five years and more elapſed without a council's being called. The remonſtrances, however, of thoſe whoſe zeal for the reformation of the church intereſted them in this event, prevailed, at length, over the pretexts and ſtratagems that were employed to put it off from time to time, and MARTIN V ſummoned a council to meet at *Pavia*, from whence it was removed to *Sienna*, and from thence to *Baſil*. The pontif did not live to be a witneſs of the proceedings of this aſſembly, being carried off by a ſudden death on the 21ſt day of February, in the year 1431, juſt about the time when the council was to meet. He was immediately ſucceeded by GABRIEL CONDOLMERUS, a native of *Venice*, and biſhop of *Sienna*, who is known in the papal liſt by the title of EUGENIUS IV. This pontif approved of all the meaſures that had been entered into by his predeceſſor in relation to the aſſembling of the council of *Baſil*, which was accordingly opened the 23d of July, 1431, under the ſuperintendence of cardinal JULIAN CESARINI, who performed the functions of preſident in the place of EUGENIUS.

---

[g] BOULAY, *Hiſtor. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. v. p. 113. et paſſim.—ARGENTRE, *Collectio Judicior. de novis erroribus*, tom. i. part. II. p. 184.—GERSONIS *Opera a Du Pinio edita*, tom. v.—BAYLE *Diction.* tom. iii. p. 2268.

The two grand points that were propoſed to the deliberation of this famous council, were, the *union of the Greek and Latin churches*, and the *reformation of the church univerſal both in its head and in its members*, according to the reſolution that had been taken in the council of *Conſtance*. For that the Roman pontifs who were conſidered as the head of the church, and the biſhops, prieſts, and monks who were looked upon as its members, were become exceſſively corrupt, and that, to uſe the expreſſion of the ſublime prophet in a ſimilar caſe, the *whole head was ſick, and the whole heart faint*, was a matter of fact too ſtriking to eſcape the knowledge of the obſcureſt individual. On the other hand, as it appeared by the very form of the council [h], by its method of proceeding, and by the firſt decrees that were enacted by its authority, that the aſſembled fathers were in earneſt and firmly reſolved to anſwer the end and purpoſe of their meeting, EUGENIUS IV, was much alarmed at the proſpect of a reformation, which he feared above all things, and contemplating with terror the zeal and deſigns of theſe ſpiritual phyſicians, he attempted twice the diſſolving of the council. Theſe repeated attempts were vigorouſly and ſucceſsfully oppoſed by the aſſembled fathers, who proved by the decrees of the council of *Conſtance*, and by other arguments equally concluſive, that the council was ſuperior, in point of authority, to the Roman pontif. This controverſy, which was the firſt that had ariſen between the council and the pope, was terminated, in the month of November 1433, by the ſilence and conceſſions of the latter, who, the month following, wrote a letter from *Rome* containing his approbation of the council, and his acknowledgement of its authority [i].

[(h) By the form of the council, Dr. MOSHEIM undoubtedly means the diviſion of the cardinals, archbiſhops, biſhops, abbots, *&c.* into four equal claſſes, without any regard to the nation or province by which they were ſent. This prudent arrangement prevented the cabals and intrigues of the Italians, whoſe biſhops were much more numerous than thoſe of other nations, and who, by their number, might have had it in their power to retard or defeat the laudable purpoſe the council had in view, had things been otherwiſe ordered.]

(i) The hiſtory of this grand and memorable council is yet wanting. The learned STEPHEN BALUZIUS (as we find in the *Hiſtoire de l'Academie des Inſcriptions & des Belles Lettres*, tom. vi. p. 544.) and after him Mr. LENFANT promiſed the world a hiſtory of this council, but neither of theſe valuable writers performed their promiſe *. The acts of this famous aſſembly have been collected, with incredible induſtry, in a great number of volumes from various archives and libraries, at the expence of RUDOLPHUS AUGUSTUS, duke of *Brunſwick*, by the very learned and laborious HERMAN van der HARDT. They are preſerved, as we are informed, in the library at *Hanover*, and they certainly deſerve to be drawn from their retreat and publiſhed to the world. In the mean time, the curious may conſult the Abridgment of the Acts of this council, which were publiſhed in 8° at *Paris*, in the year 1512, and which I have made uſe of in this Hiſtory, as alſo the following authors: ÆNEÆ SYLVII *Lib. duo de Concilio Baſileenſi.*—EDMUN. RICHERIUS, *Hiſtor. Concilior. General.* lib. iii. cap. i.—HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 447.

* Dr. MOSHEIM has here been guilty of an overſight; for LENFANT did in reality perform his promiſe, and compoſed the *Hiſtory of the Council of Baſil*, which he blended with his *Hiſtory of the War of the Huſſites*, on account of the connexion that there was between theſe two ſubjects, and alſo becauſe his advanced age prevented his indulging himſelf in the hope of being able to give a full and complete Hiſtory of the council of *Baſil* apart.

XII. Theſe

The decrees and acts of the council of *Baſil*.

XII. Theſe preliminary meaſures being finiſhed, the council proceeded with zeal and activity to the accompliſhment of the important purpoſes for which it was aſſembled. The popes legates were admitted as members of the council, but not before they had declared upon oath that they would ſubmit to the decrees that ſhould be enacted in it, and more particularly that they would adhere to the laws that had been made in the council of *Conſtance*, in relation to the ſupremacy of general councils and the ſubordination of the pontifs to their authority and juriſdiction. Nay, theſe very laws, which the popes beheld with ſuch averſion and horror were ſolemnly renewed by the aſſembled fathers the 26th of June, in the year 1434, and, on the 9th of the ſame month in the following year, the *Annats*, as they were called, were publickly aboliſhed, notwithſtanding the oppoſition that was made to this meaſure by the legates of the Roman ſee. On the 25th of March, 1436, a confeſſion of faith was read, which every pontif was to ſubſcribe on the day of his election, the number of cardinals was reduced to twenty-four, and the papal impoſitions called *Expectatives*, *Reſervations*, and *Proviſions*, were entirely annulled. Theſe meaſures, with others of a like nature, provoked Eugenius to the higheſt degree, and made him form a deſign either for removing this troubleſome and enterprizing council into *Italy*, or of ſetting up a new council in oppoſition to it, which might fix bounds to its zeal for the reformation of the church. Accordingly, on the 7th of May, in the year 1437, the aſſembled fathers having, on account of the Greeks, come to a reſolution of holding the council at *Baſil*, *Avignon*, or ſome city in the dutchy of *Savoy*, the intractable pontif oppoſed this motion, and maintained that it ſhould be transferred into *Italy*. Each of the contending parties perſevered, with the utmoſt obſtinacy, in the reſolution they had taken, and this occaſioned a warm and violent conteſt between the pope and the council. The latter ſummoned Eugenius to appear before them at *Baſil* the 26th day of July, 1437, in order to give an account of his conduct; but the pontif, inſtead of complying with this ſummons, iſſued out a decree, by which he pretended to diſſolve the council and to aſſemble another at *Ferrara*. This decree, indeed, was treated with the utmoſt contempt by the council, which, with the conſent of the emperor, the king of *France* and ſeveral other princes, continued its deliberations at *Baſil*, and, on the 28th of September, in this ſame year, pronounced a ſentence of contumacy againſt the rebellious pontif for having refuſed to obey their order.

The council of *Ferrara* held by Eugenius.

XIII. In the year 1438, Eugenius in perſon opened the council, which he had ſummoned to meet at *Ferrara*, and at the ſecond ſeſſion thundered out an excommunication againſt the fathers aſſembled at *Baſil*. The principal buſineſs that was to be tranſacted in the pontif's council was the propoſed reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches, and, in order to bring this ſalutary and important deſign to a happy iſſue, the emperor John Palæologus, the Grecian patriarch Joſephus, with the moſt eminent biſhops and doctors among the Greeks arrived in *Italy* and appeared in perſon at *Ferrara*. What animated, in a particular manner, the zeal of the Greeks in this negotiation, was the extremity to which they were reduced by the Turks, and the pleaſing hope, that their reconciliation with the Roman pontif would contribute to engage the Latins in their cauſe. Be that as it may, there was little done at *Ferrara*, where matters were carried on too ſlowly to afford any proſpect of an end of their diſſenſions; but the negotiations were more ſucceſsful at *Florence*, whither EUGENIUS removed the council about the beginning of the year 1439, on account of the plague that broke out at *Ferrara*. On the other hand, the council of *Baſil*, exaſperated by the imperious proceedings of EUGENIUS, depoſed him from the papacy on the 25th of June, in the year 1439, which vigorous meaſure was not approved of by the European kings and princes. It may be eaſily conceived what an impreſſion this ſtep made upon the affronted pontif; he loſt all patience; and devoted, for the ſecond time, to hell and damnation the members of the council of *Baſil*, by a ſolemn and moſt ſevere edict, in which alſo he declared all their acts null, and all their proceedings unlawful. This new peal of papal thunder was held in deriſion by the council of *Baſil*, who, perſiſting in their purpoſe, elected another pontif, and raiſed to that high dignity AMADEUS, duke of *Savoy*, who then lived in the moſt profound ſolitude at a delicious retreat, called *Ripaille*, upon the borders of the *Leman Lake*, and who is known in the papal liſt by the name of FELIX V.

The church afflicted with a ſchiſm.

XIV. This election was the occaſion of the revival of that deplorable ſchiſm, which had formerly rent the church and which had been terminated with ſo much difficulty, and after ſo many vain and fruitleſs efforts, at the council of *Conſtance*. Nay, the new breach was ſtill more lamentable than the former one, as the flame was kindled not only between two rival pontifs, but alſo between the two contending councils of *Baſil* and *Florence*. The greateſt part of the church ſubmitted to the juriſdiction, and adopted the cauſe of EUGENIUS; while FELIX was acknowledged, as lawful pontif by a great number of academies, and, among others, by the famous univerſity of *Paris*, as alſo in ſeveral kingdoms and provinces. The council of *Baſil* continued its deliberations, and went on enacting laws and publiſhing edicts until the year 1443, notwithſtanding the efforts of EUGENIUS and his adherents to put a ſtop to their proceedings. And, though in that year the members of the council retired to their reſpective places of abode, yet they declared publicly that the council was not diſſolved, but would reſume its deliberations at *Baſil*, *Lyons*, or *Lauſanne*, as ſoon as a proper opportunity was offered.

In the mean time the council of *Florence*, with EUGENIUS at its head, was chiefly employed in reconciling the differences between the Greeks and Latins; which weighty buſineſs was committed to the prudence, zeal, and piety of a ſelect number of eminent men on both ſides. The moſt diſtinguiſhed among thoſe whom the Greeks choſe for this purpoſe was the learned BESSARION, who was afterwards raiſed to the dignity of cardinal in the Roman church. This great man, engaged and ſeduced by the ſplendid preſents and promiſes of the Latin pontif, employed the whole extent of his authority, and the power of his eloquence, nay, he had recourſe even to promiſes and threatnings to perſuade the Greeks to accept the conditions of peace, that were propoſed by EUGENIUS. Theſe conditions required their conſent to the following points: — *That the holy Spirit proceeded from the Son, as well as from the Father*; — *that departed ſouls were purified in the infernal regions by a certain kind of fire, before their admiſſion to the preſence and viſion of the Deity*; — *that unleavened bread might be uſed in the adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper*; — and laſtly, which was the main and principal thing inſiſted upon by the Latins, *that the Roman pontif was the ſupreme judge, the true head of the univerſal church.* Such were the terms of peace to which the Greeks were obliged to ſubmit, all except MARK of *Epheſus*, whom neither entreaties nor rewards, could move from his purpoſe, or engage to ſubmit to a reconciliation founded upon ſuch conditions. And, indeed, this reconciliation, which had been brought about by various ſtratagems, was much more ſpecious than ſolid, and had, by no means, ſtability ſufficient to aſſure its duration. We find accordingly, that the Grecian deputies were no ſooner returned to *Conſtantinople*, than they declared publicly that all things had been carried on, at *Florence*, by artifice and fraud, and renewed the ſchiſm, which had been ſo imperfectly healed, a little time before. The council of *Florence* put an end to its deliberations on the 26th of April, in the year 1442 [k], without having executed any of the deſigns, that were propoſed by it, in a ſatisfactory manner. For, beſides the affair of the Greeks, they propoſed bringing the Armenians, Jacobites, and, more particularly, the Abyſſinians into the boſom of the Roman church; but this project was attended with as little ſucceſs as the other.

Which is healed under the pontificate of Nicholas V.

XV. EUGENIUS IV, who had been the occaſion of the new ſchiſm in the ſee of *Rome*, died in the month of February 1447, and was ſucceeded, in a few weeks, by THOMAS DE SARZANO, biſhop of *Bologna*, who filled the pontificate under the denomination of NICHOLAS V. This eminent prelate had, in point of merit, the beſt pretenſions poſſible to the papal throne. He was diſtinguiſhed by his erudition and genius; he was a zealous patron and protector of learned men; and, what was ſtill more laudable, he was remarkable for his moderation, and for the meek and pacific ſpirit that diſcovered itſelf in all his conduct and actions. Under his pontificate the European princes, and more eſpecially the king of *France*, exerted their warmeſt endeavours to reſtore tranquillity and union in the Latin church, and their efforts were crowned with the deſired ſucceſs. For, in the year 1449, FELIX V reſigned the papal chair, and returned to his delicious hermitage at *Ripaille*, while the fathers of the council of *Baſil* aſſembled at *Lauſanne*

---

[k] The *Hiſtory* of this council, and of the frauds and ſtratagems that were practiſed in it, was compoſed by that learned Grecian SYLVESTER SGYROPULUS, whoſe work was publiſhed at the *Hague* in the year 1660, with a Latin tranſlation, a preliminary diſcourſe, and ample notes by the learned ROBERT CREIGHTON, a native of *Great Britain.* This Hiſtory was refuted by LEO ALLATIUS, in a work entitled *Exercitationes in Creightoni Apparatum, Verſionem et Notas ad Hiſtoriam Concilii Florentini ſcriptam a Sguropolo*, Romæ 1674, 4to. See the ſame author's *Perpetua Conſenſio Eccleſiæ Oriental. et Occident.* p. 875. as alſo MABILLON. *Muſeum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 243.— SPANHEMIUS, *De perpetua diſſenſione Eccleſ. Orient. et Occident.* tom. ii. Opp. p. 491.—HERMANN. *Hiſtoria concertat. de pane azymo*, part. II. cap. v. p. 124.

Lauſanne [l], ratified his voluntary abdication, and, by a ſolemn decree, ordered the univerſal church to ſubmit to the juriſdiction of NICHOLAS as their lawful pontif. On the other hand, NICHOLAS proclaimed this treaty of peace with great pomp on the 18th of June, in the ſame year, and ſet the ſeal of his approbation and authority to the acts and decrees of the council of *Baſil*. This pontif diſtinguiſhed himſelf in a very extraordinary manner by his love of learning, and by his ardent zeal for the propagation of the liberal arts and ſciences, which he promoted in *Italy*, with great ſucceſs, by the encouragement he granted to the learned Greeks, who came from *Conſtantinople* into that country [m]. The principal occaſion of his death was the fatal revolution that threw this capital of the Grecian empire into the hands of the Turks; this melancholy event preyed upon his ſpirits, and, at length, ended his days on the 24th of March, in the year 1455.

Pius II.

XVI. His ſucceſſor ALPHONSUS BORGIA, who was a native of *Spain*, and is known in the papal liſt by the denomination of CALIXTUS III, was remarkable for nothing but his ſeal in animating the Chriſtian princes to make war upon the Turks; his reign alſo was ſhort, for he died in the year 1458. ÆNEAS SYLVIUS PICCOLOMINI, who ſucceeded him in the pontificate that ſame year, under the title of PIUS II, rendered his name much more illuſtrious, not only by his extenſive genius and the important tranſactions that were carried on during his adminiſtration, but alſo by the various and uſeful productions with which he enriched the republic of letters. The luſtre of his fame was, indeed, tarniſhed by a ſcandalous proof which he gave of his fickleneſs and inconſtancy, or rather perhaps of his bad faith; for after having vigorouſly defended, againſt the pontifs, the dignity and prerogatives of general councils, and maintained with peculiar boldneſs and obſtinacy the cauſe of the council of *Baſil* againſt EUGENIUS IV, he ignominiouſly renounced theſe generous principles upon his acceſſion to the pontificate, and acted in direct oppoſition to them during the whole courſe of his adminiſtration. Thus, in the year 1460, he denied publicly that the pope was ſubordinate to a general council, and even prohibited all appeals to ſuch a council under the ſevereſt penalties. The year following, he obtained from LEWIS XI, king of *France*, the abrogation of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which favoured, in a particular manner, the pretenſions of the general councils to ſupremacy in the church [n]. But the moſt egregious

---

[l] The abdication of FELIX V was made on the 9th of April, 1449, and it was ratified the 16th day of the month, by the aſſembled fathers at *Lauſanne*.

[m] See DOM. GEORGII *Vita Nicolai* V, *ad fidem veterum Monumentorum:* to which is added a treatiſe, entitled DISQUISITIO *de Nicolai* V, *erga litteras et litteratos viros patrocinio*, publiſhed in 4to at *Rome*, in the year 1742.

[(n) There was a famous edict, entitled *The Pragmatic Sanction*, iſſued out by LEWIS IX, who, though he is honoured with a place in the Kalendar, was yet a zealous aſſertor of the liberty and privileges of the Gallican church againſt the deſpotic encroachments and pretenſions of the Roman pontifs. It was againſt their tyrannical proceedings and intolerable extortions, that this edict was chiefly leveled; and though ſome creatures of the court of *Rome* have thrown out inſinuations of its being a ſpurious production, yet the contrary is evident from its having been regiſtred, as the authentic edict of that pious monarch by the parliament of *Paris* in the year 1461, by the ſtates of the kingdom aſſembled at *Tours* in the year 1483, and by the univerſity of *Paris* in 1491.—See, for inſtance of impudence and perfidy that he exhibited to the world was in the year 1463, when he publiſhed a ſolemn retractation of all that he had written in favour of the council of *Baſil*, and declared, without either ſhame or heſitation, that, as ÆNEAS SYLVIUS, he was a damnable heretic; but as PIUS II, he was an orthodox pontif. This indecent declaration was the laſt circumſtance, worthy of notice, that happened during his pontificate; for he departed this life in the month of July, in the year 1464 [*o*].

Paulus II.

XVII. PAUL II, a Venetian by birth, whoſe name was PETER BARD, was raiſed to the head of the church, in the year 1464, and died in the year 1471. His adminiſtration was diſtinguiſhed by ſome meaſures, which, if we conſider the genius of the times, were worthy of praiſe, though it muſt, at the ſame time, be confeſſed that he did many things, which were evidently inexcuſable, not to mention his reducing the jubile circle to twenty five years, and thus accelerated the return of that moſt abſurd and ſuperſtitious ceremony. So that his reputation became, at leaſt, dubious in after times, and was viewed in different lights, by different perſons [*p*]. The following

---

a farther account of this edict, the excellent *Hiſtory of France* (begun by the Abbé VELLY, and continued by M. VILLARET) vol. vi. p. 57.

The edict which Dr. MOSHEIM has in view here, is the *Pragmatic Sanction* that was drawn up at *Bourges*, in the year 1438, by CHARLES VII, king of *France*, with the conſent of the moſt eminent prelates and grandees of the nation, who were aſſembled at that place. This edict (which was abſolutely neceſſary in order to deliver the French clergy from the vexations they ſuffered from the encroachments of the popes, ever ſince the latter had fixed their reſidence at *Avignon)* conſiſted of twenty-three articles, in which, among other ſalutary regulations, the elections to vacant benefices were reſtored to their ancient purity and freedom *; the *Annates* and other pecuniary pretenſions and encroachments of the pontifs aboliſhed, and the authority of a general council declared ſuperior to that of the pope. This edict was drawn up in concert with the fathers of the council of *Baſil*, and the twenty-three articles, it contains, were taken from the decrees of that council; though they were admitted by the Gallican church with certain modifications, which the nature of the times, and the manners of the nation rendered expedient. Such then was the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which pope PIUS II engaged LEWIS XI (who received upon that occaſion, for him and his ſucceſſors, the title of *Moſt Chriſtian*) to aboliſh by a ſolemn declaration, the full execution of which was, however, prevented by the noble ſtand made by the univerſity of *Paris* in favour of the *Pragmatic Sanction*. LEWIS alſo perceiving that he had been deluded into this declaration by the treacherous inſinuations of GEOFFRY, biſhop of *Arras* (whom the pope had bribed with a cardinal's cap, and large promiſes of a more lucrative kind) took no ſort of pains to have it executed, but publiſhed, on the contrary, new edicts againſt the pecuniary pretenſions and extortions of the court of *Rome*. So that in reality the *Pragmatic Sanction* was not aboliſhed before the *Concordate*, or agreement which was tranſacted between FRANCIS I and LEO X, in the year 1517, and was forced upon the French nation in oppoſition to the united efforts of the clergy, the univerſity, the parliament, and the people. See, for a farther account of this matter, DU CLOS *Hiſtoire de Louis* XI, vol. i. p. 115—132.]

[*o*] Beſides the writers of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſee *Nouveaux Diction. Hiſtor. et Critique*, tom. ii. at the article ENEE SYLVIUS, p. 26.

[*p*] PAUL II has had the good fortune to find, in one of the moſt eminent and learned men of this age (the famous cardinal LUIRINI) a zealous apologiſt. See among the productions of that

* That is to ſay, that theſe elections were wreſted out of the hands of the popes, who had uſurped them, and that, by the *Pragmatic Sanction*, every church had the privilege of chuſing its biſhop, and every monaſtery its abbot or prior.—By the *Concordate*, or agreement between FRANCIS I and LEO X (which was ſubſtituted in the place of the *Pragmatic Saction)* the nomination to the biſhoprics in *France*, and the collation of certain benefices of the higher claſs were veſted in the kings of *France*. An ample and ſatisfactory account of this convention may be ſeen in biſhop BURNET's excellent *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 3. and in a book, entitled *Hiſtoire du Droit public Eccleſiaſtique François*, publiſhed in octavo, in 1737, and in quarto, in 1752.

CENT. XV.

pontifs, SIXTUS IV, and INNOCENT VIII, whoſe names were FRANCIS ALBESCOLA and JOHN BAPTIST CIBO, were neither remarkable for their virtues nor their vices. The former departed this life in the year 1484, and the latter in 1492. Filled with the moſt terrible apprehenſions of the danger that threatned *Europe*, in general, and *Italy* in particular, from the growing power of the Turks, they both attempted putting themſelves in a poſture of defence, and warmly exhorted the European princes to put a ſtop to the progreſs of that warlike people. But many obſtacles aroſe, which prevented the execution of this important deſign, and rendered the exhortations of theſe zealous pontifs without effect. The other undertakings that were projected or carried on, during their continuance at the head of the church, are not of importance ſufficient to require particular notice.

Alexander VI.

XVIII. In the ſeries of pontifs, that ruled the church during this century, the laſt, in order of time, was ALEXANDER VI, a Spaniard by birth, whoſe name was RODERIC BORGIA. The life and actions of this man ſhew, that there was a *Nero* among the popes, as well as among the emperors. The cries and enormities, that hiſtory has imputed to this papal *Nero*, evidently prove him to have been, not only deſtitute of all religious and virtuous principles, but even regardleſs of decency, and hardened againſt the very feeling of ſhame. And, though it may be poſſible, that the malignity of his enemies may have forged falſe accuſations againſt him, and, in ſome inſtances, exaggerated the horror of his real crimes, yet there is upon record an authentic liſt of undoubted facts, which, both by their number and their atrocity, are ſufficient to render the name and memory of ALEXANDER VI odious and deteſtable in the eſteem even of ſuch as have the ſmalleſt tincture of virtuous principles and feelings. An inordinate affection for his children was the principal ſource, from whence proceeded a great part of the crimes he committed. He had four ſons of a concubine with whom he had lived many years, among whom was the infamous CÆSAR BORGIA. A daughter named LUCRETIA, was likewiſe among the fruits of this unlawful commerce. The tenderneſs of the pontif for this ſpurious offſpring was exceſſive beyond all expreſſion; his only aim was to load them with riches and honours, and, in the execution of this purpoſe, he trampled with contempt upon every obſtacle, which the demands of juſtice, the dictates of reaſon, and the remonſtrances of religion laid in his way [q]. Thus he went on in his profligate carreer until the year 1503, when the poiſon, which he and his ſon CÆSAR had mingled for others who ſtood in the way of their avarice and ambition, cut ſhort, by a happy miſtake, his own days [r].

---

illuſtrious prelate, the piece entitled, *Pauli* II *Vita ex Codice Anglicæ Bibliothecæ deſumpta, præmiſſis ipſius vindiciis adverſus Platinam*, alioſque obtrectatores. *Romæ* 1740, in 4^{to}.

[q] The life of this execrable tyrant has been written in Engliſh by Mr. ALEXANDER GORDON, whoſe work was tranſlated into French, and publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in 1732. The ſame ſubject has, however, been handled with more moderation by the ingenious and learned author of the *Hiſtoire du Droit Publ. Eccleſ. François*, to which Hiſtory are ſubjoined the lives of ALEXANDER VI and LEO X.

[r] Such is the account which the beſt hiſtorians have given of the death of ALEXANDER VI; VOLTAYRE, notwithſtanding, has pretended to prove that this pontif died a natural death.

XIX. The

The monks.

XIX. The monaſtic ſocieties, as we learn from a multitude of authentic records, and from the teſtimonies of the beſt writers, were, at this time, ſo many herds of lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious Epicureans, whoſe views in life were confined to opulence, idleneſs, and pleaſure. The rich monks, particularly thoſe of the Benedictine and Auguſtine orders, perverted their revenues to the gratification of their luſts, and renouncing, in their conduct, all regard to their reſpective rules of diſcipline, drew upon themſelves a popular odium by their ſenſuality and licentiouſneſs [s]. This was matter of affliction to many wiſe and good men, eſpecially in *France* and *Germany*, who formed the pious deſign of ſtemming the torrent of monkiſh luxury, and excited a ſpirit of reformation among that degenerate order [t]. Among the German reformers, who undertook the reſtoration of virtue and temperance in the convents, Nicholas de Mazen, an Auſtrian abbot, and Nicholas Dunkelspuhl, profeſſor at *Vienna*, held the firſt rank. They attempted, with unparalleled zeal and aſſiduity, the reformation of the Benedictines throughout all *Germany*, and ſucceeded ſo far, as to reſtore, at leaſt, a certain air of decency and virtue in the monaſteries of *Swabia*, *Franconia*, and *Bavaria* [u]. The reformation of the ſame order was attempted in *France* by many, and particularly by Guido, or Guy Juvenal, a learned man, whoſe writings, upon that and on other ſubjects, were received with applauſe [w]. It is however certain, that the greateſt part of the monks, both in *France* and elſewhere, reſiſted, with obſtinacy, the ſalutary attempts of theſe ſpiritual phyſicians, and returned their zeal with the worſt treatment, that it was poſſible to ſhew them.

The Mendicants.

XX. While the opulent monks exhibited to the world ſcandalous examples of luxury, ignorance, lazineſs, and licentiouſneſs, accompanied with a barbarous averſion to every thing that carried the remoteſt aſpect of ſcience, the Mendicants, and more eſpecially the Dominicans and Franciſcans, were chargeable with irregularities of another kind. Beſides their arrogance, which was exceſſive, a quarrelſome and litigious ſpirit, an ambitious deſire of encroaching upon the rights and privileges of others, an inſatiable zeal for the propagation of ſuperſtition, and the itch of diſputing and of ſtarting abſurd and intricate queſtions of a religious kind prevailed among them, and drew upon them juſtly the diſpleaſure and indignation of many. It was this wrangling ſpirit that perpetuated the controverſies which had ſubſiſted ſo long between them and the biſhops, and indeed the whole ſacerdotal order; and it was their vain curioſity and their inordinate paſſion for novelty, that made the divines, in the greateſt part of the European academies, complain of the dangerous and deſtructive errors they had introduced into religion. These complaints were repeated without interruption, in all the provinces where the Mendicants had any credit; and the ſame complaints were often preſented to the court of *Rome*, where they exerciſed ſufficiently both the patience and ſubtilty of the pontifs and their miniſters. The different pontifs that ruled the church, during this century, were differently affected towards the Mendicants; ſome patronized them; others oppoſed them; and this circumſtance frequently changed the face of things, and, for a long time, rendered the deciſion of the conteſt dubious [x]. The perſecution, that was carried on againſt the *Beguins*, became alſo an occaſion of increaſing the odium that had been caſt upon the begging monks, and was extremely prejudicial to their intereſts. For the *Beguins* and *Lollards*, to eſcape the fury of their inveterate enemies, the biſhops and others, frequently took refuge in the third order of the Franciſcans, Dominicans, and Auguſtinians, hoping that, in the patronage and protection of theſe powerful and reſpected ſocieties, they ſhould find a ſecure retreat from the calamities that oppreſſed them. Nor were their hopes entirely diſappointed here; but the ſtorm that hitherto purſued them, fell upon their new patrons and protectors, the *Mendicants*, who by affording a refuge to a ſect ſo odious to the clergy drew upon themſelves the indignation of that ſacred order, and were thereby involved in great difficulties and perplexities of various kinds [y].

---

[s] See Martini Senging *Tuitiones Ordinis S. Benedicti*, ſeu *Oratio* in *Concilio Baſileenſi*, A. 1433, contra vitia Benedict. recitata, in Bernh Pezii *Biblioth. Aſcetica*, tom. viii. p. 517.

[t] See Lejbnitii *Præf. ad* tom. ii. *Scriptor. Brunſvic.* p. 40.

[u] For an account of theſe reformers, ſee Martin. Kropf *Bibliotheca Mellicenſis, ſeu de vitis et Scriptis Benedictinor. Mellicenſium*, p. 143. 163. 203. 206.

[w] See Liron, *Singularités Hiſtoriques et Litteraires*, tom. iii. p. 49.

The fate of the Fratricelli.

XXI. The more auſtere and rebellious Franciſcans, who, ſeparating themſelves from the church, renounced their allegiance to the Roman pontifs, and were diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of *Fratricelli*, or *Minorites*, continued, together with their *Tertiaries*, the *Beghards*, to carry on an open war againſt the court of *Rome*. Their head quarters were in *Italy*, in the marquiſate of *Ancona*, and the neighbouring countries; for it was there that their leader and chief ruler reſided. They were perſecuted about the middle of this century, with the greateſt ſeverity, by pope NICHOLAS V, who employed every method he could think of to vanquiſh their obſtinacy, ſending for that purpoſe ſucceſſively againſt them the Franciſcan monks, armed hoſts, and civil magiſtrates, and commiting to the flames, many of thoſe who remained unmoved by all theſe means of converſion [z]. This heavy perſecution was carried on by the ſucceeding pontifs, and by none with greater bitterneſs and vehemence than by PAUL II; though it is ſaid, that this pope choſe rather to conquer the head-ſtrong and ſtubborn perſeverance of this ſect by impriſonment and exile, than by fire and ſword [a]. The *Fratricelli*, on the other hand, animated by the protection of ſeveral perſons of great influence, who became their patrons on account of the ſtriking appearance of ſanctity which they exhibited to the world, oppoſed force to force, and went ſo far as to put to death ſome of the inquiſitors, among whom ANGELO of *Camaldoli* fell a victim to their vengeance [b]. Nor were the commotions, raiſed by this troubleſome ſect, confined to *Italy*; other countries felt the effects of their petulant zeal; and *Bohemia* and *Sileſia* (where they preached with warmth their favorite doctrine, *that the true imitation of Chriſt conſiſted in beggary, and extreme poverty*) became the theatre of this ſpiritual war [c]. The king of *Bohemia* was well affected to theſe fanatics, granted them his protection, and was, on that account, excommunicated by PAUL II [d]. In *France* their affairs were far from being proſperous; ſuch of them as fell into the hands of the inquiſitors were committed to the flames [e], and they were eagerly ſearched after in the province of *Tholouſe* and the adjacent countries, where great numbers of them lay concealed, and endeavoured to eſcape the vigilance of their enemies; while ſeveral of their ſcattered parties removed to *England* and *Ireland* [f]. The dreadful ſeries of calamities and perſecutions, that purſued this miſerable ſect was not ſufficient to extinguiſh it entirely; for it ſubſiſted until the times of the reformation in *Germany*, when its remaining votaries adopted the cauſe and embraced the doctrine and diſcipline of LUTHER.

---

[x] See LAUNOII *Lib. de Canone: Omnis Utriuſque Sexus*, Opp. tom. i. part. I. p. 287.—BOULAY, *Hiſt. Acad. Pariſ.* tom. v. p. 189. 196. 204. 522. 558. 601. 617. 752.—ANT. WOOD, *Antiqq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 210. 212. 224.

[y] See the preceding century.

[z] MAURITIUS SARTIUS, *De Antiqua Picentum civitate Cupromontana*, in ANGELI CALOGERÆ *Raccolta di Opuſculi Scientifici*, tom. xxxix. p. 39. 81. 97. where we have ſeveral extracts from the *Manuſcript Dialogue of* JACOBUS DE MARCHIA againſt the *Fratricelli*.

[a] ANG. MAR. QUIRINI *Vita Pauli* II, p. 78.—JO. TARGIONIUS *Præf. ad Claror. Venetor. Epiſtolas ad Magliabechium*, tom. i. p. 43. where we have an account of the books that were written againſt the *Fratricelli* by NICHOLAS PALMERIUS and others under the pontificate of *Paul* II, and which are yet in manuſcript.

New orders: the Brethren and Clerks of the common life.

XXII. Of the religious fraternities that were founded in this century, none deſerves a more honourable mention, that the *Brethren and clerks of the common life* (as they called themſelves) who lived under the rule of ST. AUGUSTIN, and were eminently uſeful in promoting the cauſe of religion, learning, and virtue. This ſociety had been formed in the preceding age by GERARD DE GROOTE, a native of *Deventer* [g], and a man remarkable for his fervent piety and extenſive erudition; it was not, however, before the preſent century, that it received a proper degree of conſiſtence, and, having obtained the approbation of the council of *Conſtance*, flouriſhed in *Holland*, the *Lower Germany*, and the adjacent provinces. It was divided into two claſſes, the *Lettered Brethren*, or *Clerks*, and the *Illiterate*, who, though they occupied ſeparate habitations, lived in the firmeſt bonds of fraternal union. The *Clerks* applied themſelves, with exemplary zeal and aſſiduity, to the ſtudy of polite literature, and to the education of youth. They compoſed learned works for the inſtruction of their contemporaries, and erected ſchools and ſeminaries of learning wherever they went. The *Illiterate Brethren*, on the other hand, were employed in manual labour and exerciſed, with ſucceſs, the mechanic arts. Neither of the two claſſes were under the reſtraint of religious *vows*; yet they had all things in common, and this community was the great bond of their union. The *Siſters* of this virtuous ſociety lived much in the ſame manner, and employed the hours, that were not conſecrated to prayer and reading, in the education of young girls, and in branches of induſtry ſuitable to their ſex. The ſchools, that were erected by the *Clerks* of this fraternity, acquired a great and illuſtrious reputation in this century. From them iſſued forth thoſe immortal reſtorers of learning and taſte that gave a new face to the republic of letters in *Germany* and *Holland*, ſuch as ERASMUS of *Rotterdam*, ALEXANDER HEGIUS, JOHN MURMELIUS, and ſeveral others [*h*]. The inſtitution of the order of the Jeſuits ſeemed to diminiſh the credit of theſe excellent ſchools, which, from that period, began to decline, and of which there are, at this time, but very few remaining. The *Brethren of the common life* were frequently called *Beghards* and *Lollards*, appellations that had been given to ſo many different ſects, and were obliged to ſuſtain the inſults and oppoſition of the clergy and monks, who had an inexpreſſible averſion to every thing that bore the remoteſt aſpect of learning or taſte [*i*].

---

[b] See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Maii*, p. 356.

[c] JO. GEORGII SCHELHORNII *Acta Hiſtorica Ecclеſ.* part. I. p. 66. 283.

[d] QUIRINI *Vita Pauli* II, p. 73.

[e] I have in manuſcript in my poſſeſſion, the acts, or decrees, of the *Inquiſition* againſt JOHN GUDULCHI DE CASTELLIONE and FRANCIS DE ARCHATA, both of them *Fratricelli*, who were burnt in *France* in the year 1454.

[f] WOOD, *Antiqq. Oxonienſ.* tom. i. p. 232.

[g] The life of this famous Dutchman GERARD GROOTE was written by THOMAS à KEMPIS, and is to be found in his Works. It ſtands at the head of the lives of eleven of his contemporaries, which were compoſed by this eminent writer.

The Greek writers.

XXIII. Of the Greeks, who acquired a name by their learned productions, the moſt eminent were,

SIMEON of *Theſſalonica*, the author of ſeveral treatiſes, and, among others, of a book againſt the *Hereſies* that had troubled the church, to which we may add his writings againſt the Latins, which are yet extant [*k*];

JOSEPHUS BRYENNIUS, who wrote a book *Concerning the Trinity*, and another againſt the Latins;

MACARIUS MACRES, whoſe animoſity againſt the Latins was carried to the greateſt height;

GEORGE PHRANZA, whoſe hiſtorical talent makes a figure in the compilation of the Byzantine hiſtorians;

MARCUS EPHESUS, who was an obſtinate enemy to the council of *Florence* [*l*];

[*h*] Accounts of this order have been given by AUB. MIRÆUS, in his *Chronicon, ad A.* 1384, and by HELYOT, in his *Hiſtory of the Religious Orders*, tom. iii. But, in that which I have here given, there are ſome circumſtances taken from ancient records not yet publiſhed. I have in my poſſeſſion ſeveral manuſcripts, which furniſh materials for a much clearer and more circumſtantial account of the inſtitution and progreſs of this order, than can be derived from the books that have hitherto appeared on that ſubject.

[*i*] We read frequently, in the records of this century, of ſchools erected by the *Lollards*, and ſometimes by the *Beghards*, at *Deventer, Brunſwic, Koningſberg*, and *Munſter*, and many other places. Now theſe *Lollards* were the *Clerks of the common life*, who, on account of their virtue, induſtry, and learning, which rendered them ſo uſeful in the education of youth, were invited by the magiſtrates of ſeveral cities to reſide among them.

[*k*] JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Bibl. Græc.* vol. xiv. p. 491—RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſ. par* M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 400.

[*l*] RICH. SIMON *l. c.* tom. i. p. 431.

Cardinal BESSARION, the illuſtrious protector and ſupporter of the Platonic ſchool, a man of unparalleled genius and erudition; but much hated by the Greeks, becauſe he ſeemed to lean to the party of the Latins, and propoſed an union of the two nations to the prejudice of the former [m];

GEORGE SCHOLARIUS, otherwiſe called GENNADIUS, who wrote againſt the Latins, and more eſpecially againſt the council of *Florence*, with more learning, candour, and perſpicuity than the reſt of his countrymen [n];

GEORGE GEMISTIUS PLETHO, a man of eminent learning, who excited many of the Italians to the ſtudy, not only of the Platonic philoſophy in particular, but of Grecian literature in general;

GEORGE of *Trapeſond*, who tranſlated ſeveral of the moſt eminent Grecian authors into Latin, and ſupported the cauſe of the Latins againſt the Greeks by his dexterous and eloquent pen;

GEORGE CODINUS, of whom we have yet remaining ſeveral productions relating to the Byzantine hiſtory.

Latin writers.

XXIV. The tribe of Latin writers, that adorned or diſhonoured this century, is not to be numbred. We ſhall therefore confine ourſelves to the enumeration of thoſe who wrote upon theological matters, and even of theſe we ſhall only mention the moſt eminent. At their head we may juſtly place JOHN GERSON, chancellor of the univerſity of *Paris*, the moſt illuſtrious ornament that this age can boaſt of, a man of the greateſt influence and authority, whom the council of *Conſtance* looked upon as its oracle, the lovers of liberty as their patron, and whoſe memory is yet precious to ſuch among the French, as are at all zealous for the maintenance of their privileges againſt papal deſpotiſm [o]. This excellent man publiſhed a conſiderable number of treatiſes that were admirably adapted to reform the corruptions of a ſuperſtitious worſhip, to excite a ſpirit of genuine piety, and to heal the wounds of a divided church: though, in ſome reſpects, he does not ſeem to have underſtood thoroughly the demands and injunctions of the goſpel of CHRIST. The moſt eminent among the other theological writers were,

NICHOLAS DE CLEMANGIS, a man of uncommon candour and integrity, who lamented, in the moſt eloquent and affecting ſtrains, the calamities of the times, and the unhappy ſtate of the Chriſtian church [p];

---

[m] For an account of BESSARION and the other learned men here mentioned, ſee BORNERUS and HODY, in their hiſtories of the Reſtoration of Letters in *Italy*, by the Greeks that took refuge there after the taking of *Conſtantinople*; add to theſe the *Bibliotheca Græca* of FABRICIUS.

[n] RICH. SIMON, *Croyance de l'Egliſe Orientale ſur la Tranſubſtantiation*, p. 87. & *Critique de M.* DU PIN, tom. i. p. 438.

[o] See DU PIN *Gerſonianorum Libri* iv. which are prefixed to the edition of the Works of GERSON, which we owe to that laborious author, and which was publiſhed at *Antwerp* in five volumes, folio, in the year 1706. See alſo JO. LAUNOII *Hiſtoria Gymnaſii Regii Navarreni*, part. III. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 514. tom. iv. part. I. Opp.—HERM. von der HARDT *Acta Concil. Conſtant.* tom. i. part. IV. p. 26.

[p] See LAUNOII *Hiſtor. Gymnaſ. Navarr.* part. III. lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 555.—LONGUEVAL, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe Gallicane*, tom. xiv. p. 436.—The Works of CLEMANGIS were publiſhed, ſome pieces excepted, at *Leyden*, with a Gloſſary, in the year 1631, by LYDIUS.

ALPHONSUS TOSTATUS, biſhop of *Avila*, who loaded the Holy Scriptures with an unwieldy and voluminous Commentary, and compoſed alſo other works, in which there is a great mixture of good and bad;

AMBROSE of *Camalduli*, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his profound knowledge of the Greek language, and his uncommon acquaintance with Grecian literature, as alſo by the zeal and induſtry he diſcovered in the attempts he made to effectuate a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

NICHOLAS DE CUSA, a man of vaſt erudition, and no mean genius, though not ſo famed for the ſolidity of his judgment, as may appear from a work of his entitled, *Conjectures concerning the laſt day* [q].

JOHN NIEDER, whoſe writings are very proper to give us an accurate notion of the manners and ſpirit of the age in which he lived, and whoſe voyages and tranſactions have rendered him famous;

JOHN CAPISTRAN, who was in high eſteem at the court of *Rome* on account of the ardor and vehemence with which he defended the juriſdiction and majeſty of the pontifs againſt all their enemies and oppoſers [r];

JOHN WESSELUS and **JEROME SAVANAROLA**, who may juſtly be placed among the wiſeſt and worthieſt men of this age. The former, who was a native of *Groningen*, and on account of his extraordinary penetration and ſagacity, was called the *Light of the World*, propagated ſeveral of thoſe doctrines, which LUTHER afterwards inculcated with greater evidence and energy, and animadverted with freedom and candour upon the corruptions of the Roman church [s]. The latter was a Dominican and a native of *Ferrara*, remarkable for piety, eloquence, and learning, who touched the ſores of the church with a heavier hand, and inveighed againſt the pontifs with greater ſeverity. This freedom coſt him dear; he was committed to the flames at *Florence* in the year 1498, and bore his fate with the moſt triumphant fortitude and ſerenity of mind [t];

ALPHONSUS SPINA, who wrote a book againſt the Jews and Saracens, which he called *Fortalitium Fidei*.

To all theſe we muſt join the whole tribe of the ſcholaſtic writers, whoſe chief ornaments were, JOHN CAPREOLUS, JOHN DE TURRECREMATA, ANTONINUS of *Florence*, DIONYSIUS à RYCKEL, HENRY GORCOMIUS, GABRIEL BIEL, STEPHEN BRULIFER, and others. The moſt remarkable among the myſtics were, VINCENTIUS FERRERIRUS, HENR. HARPHIUS, LAURENTIUS JUSTINIANUS, BERNARDINUS SENENSIS, and THOMAS à

---

[q] BAYLE, *Reponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, tom. ii. cap. cxvii. p. 517.—The Works of NICHOLAS were publiſhed, in one volume, at *Baſil*, in the year 1565.

[r] LENFANT, *Hiſtoire de la Guerre des Huſſites*, tom. ii. p. 254.—WADDINGI *Annales Minorum*, tom. ix. p. 67.

[s] JO. HENR. MAII *Vita Reuchlini*, p. 156.

[t] B. JO. FRANC. BUDDEI *Parerga Hiſtorico-Theologica*. The life of SAVANAROLA was written by J. FRANCIS PICUS, and publiſhed in two volumes 8vo at *Paris*, with various Annotations, Letters, and original Pieces by QUETIF, in the year 1674. The ſame editor publiſhed alſo at *Paris*, that ſame year, the *Spiritual and Aſcetic Epiſtles of* SAVANAROLA, tranſlated from the Italian into Latin. See ECHARD, *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 884.

KEMPIS, who ſhone among theſe with a ſuperior luſtre, and to whom the famous book *Concerning the Imitation of Chriſt*, is commonly attributed [u].

CHAP. III.

Concerning the ſtate of religion, and the doctrine of the church, during this century.

The corrupt ſtate of religion.

I. THE ſtate of religion was become ſo corrupt among the Latins, that it was utterly deſtitute of any thing that could attract the eſteem of the truly virtuous and judicious part of mankind. This is a fact, which even they whoſe prejudices render them unwilling to acknowledge it, will never preſume to deny. Among the Greeks and Orientals religion had ſcarcely a better aſpect than among the Latins; at leaſt, if the difference was in their favour, it was far from being conſiderable. The worſhip of the Deity conſiſted in a round of frivolous and inſipid ceremonies. The diſcourſes of thoſe who inſtructed the people in public, were not only deſtitute of ſenſe, judgment, and ſpirit, but even of piety and devotion, and were in reality nothing more than a motley mixture of the groſſeſt fictions, and the moſt extravagant inventions. The reputation of Chriſtian knowledge and piety was eaſily acquired; it was laviſhed upon ſuch as profeſſed a profound veneration for the ſacred order, and their ghoſtly head the Roman pontif, who ſtudied to render the ſaints, (*i. e.* their miniſters) propitious by frequent and rich donations, who were exact and regular in the obſervance of the ſtated ceremonies of the church, and who had wealth enough to pay the fines which the papal quæſtors had annexed to the commiſſion of all the different degrees of tranſgreſſion, or, in other words, to purchaſe indulgences. Such were the ingredients of *ordinary* piety; but ſuch as added to theſe a certain degree of auſterity and bodily mortification were placed in the higheſt order of worthies, and conſidered as the peculiar favorites of heaven. On the other hand, the number of thoſe who were ſtudious to acquire a juſt notion of religious matters, to inveſtigate the true ſenſe of the ſacred writings, and to model their lives and manners after the precepts and example of the divine Saviour, was extremely ſmall, and ſuch had much difficulty in eſcaping the gibbet, in an age where virtue and ſenſe were looked upon as heretical.

Defenders of the true religion raiſed by providence in ſeveral places.

II. This miſerable ſtate of things, this enormous perverſion of religion and morality throughout almoſt all the weſtern provinces, were obſerved and deplored by many wiſe and good men, who all endeavoured, though in different ways, to ſtem the torrent of ſuperſtition, and to reform a corrupt church. In *England* and *Scotland* the diſciples of WICLEF, whom the multitude had ſtigmatized with the odious title of *Lollards*, continued to inveigh againſt the deſpotic laws of the pontifs, and the licentious manners of the clergy [w]. The *Waldenſes*, though perſecuted and oppreſſed on all ſides and from every quarter, raiſed their voices, even in the remote vallies and lurking places whither they were driven by the violence of their enemies, and called aloud for ſuccour to the expiring cauſe of religion and virtue. Even in *Italy* many, and among others the famous SAVANAROLA, had the courage to declare that *Rome* was become the image of *Babylon*, and this notion was ſoon adopted by multitudes of all ranks and conditions. But the greateſt part of the clergy and monks, perſuaded that their honours, influence, and riches would diminiſh in proportion to the increaſe of knowledge among the people, and would receive inexpreſſible detriment from the downfal of ſuperſtition, oppoſed, with all their might, every thing that had the remoteſt aſpect of a reformation, and impoſed ſilence upon theſe importunate cenſors by the formidable authority of fire and ſword.

---

[u] The late Abbé LANGLET DE FRESNOY promiſed the world a demonſtration that this famous book, whoſe true author has been ſo much diſputed among the learned, was originally wrote in French by a perſon named GERSEN, or GERSON, and only tranſlated into Latin by THOMAS à KEMPIS. See GRANETUS in *Launoianis*, part. II. tom. iv. part. II. Opp. p. 414, 415. The Hiſtory of this famous book is given by VINCENTIUS THUILLIERIUS, in the *Opera Poſthumæ Mabilloni et Ruinarti*, tom. iii. p. 54.

Commotions in *Bohemia*.

III. The religious diſſenſions, that had been excited in *Bohemia* by the miniſtry of JOHN HUSS and his diſciple JACOBELLUS DE MISA, were doubly enflamed by the deplorable fate of HUSS and JEROME of *Prague*, and broke out into an open war which was carried on with the moſt ſavage and unparalleled barbarity. The followers of HUSS, who pleaded for the adminiſtration of the cup to the laity in the holy ſacrament, being perſecuted and oppreſſed in various ways by the emiſſaries and miniſters of the court of *Rome*, retired to a ſteep and high mountain in the diſtrict of *Bechin*, in which they held their religious meetings, and adminiſtered the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper *under both kinds*. This mountain they called *Thabor*, from the tents which they at firſt erected there for their habitation; and in proceſs of time they raiſed a ſtrong fortification for its defence, and adorned it with a well-built and regular city. Nor did they ſtop here; but, forming more grand and important projects, they choſe for their chiefs NICHOLAS of *Huſſinet*, and the famous JOHN ZISKA, a Bohemian knight, a man of the moſt undaunted courage and reſolution; and propoſed, under the ſtandards of theſe valiant leaders, to revenge the death of HUS and JEROME upon the creatures of the Roman pontif, and obtain a liberty of worſhiping God in a more rational manner, than that which was preſcribed by the church of *Rome*. After the death of NICHOLAS, which happened in the year 1420, ZISKA commanded alone this warlike body, and had the ſatisfaction to ſee his army increaſe from day to day. During the firſt tumults of this war, which were no more than a prelude to calamities of a much more dreadful kind, WENCESLAUS, king of *Bohemia*, departed this life in the year 1419 [x].

[w] See WILKIN's *Concilia Magnæ Britann. et Hibern.* tom. iv.—WOOD, *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 202. 204.

[(x) This prince had no ſooner began to execute the decrees of the council of *Conſtance* againſt the Huſſites, than the inhabitants of *Prague* took fire at this proceeding, raiſed a tumult, murdered the magiſtrates who publiſhed the order, and committed other outrages, which filled the court of

The Huſſite war carried on by Ziſka and Procopius Raſa.

IV. The emperor Sigismund, who ſucceeded him in the throne of *Bohemia*, employed not only edicts and remonſtrances, but alſo the terror of penal laws and the force of arms to put an end to theſe lamentable diviſions; and great numbers of the Huſſites periſhed, by his orders, in the moſt barbarous manner. The Bohemians, irritated by theſe inhuman proceedings, threw off his deſpotic yoke in the year 1420, and, with Ziska at their head, made war againſt their ſovereign. This famous leader, though deprived of his ſight, diſcovered, in every ſtep he took, ſuch an admirable mixture of prudence and intrepidity, that his name became a terror to his enemies. Upon his death, which happened in the year 1424, the plurality of the Huſſites choſe for their general Procopius Rasa, a man alſo of undaunted courage and reſolution, who maintained their cauſe and carried on the war with ſpirit and ſucceſs. The acts of barbarity that were committed on both ſides, were ſhocking and terrible beyond expreſſion; for notwithſtanding the irreconcileable oppoſition that there was between the religious ſentiments of the contending parties, they both agreed in this one horrible point, that it was innocent and lawful to perſecute and extirpate with fire and ſword the enemies of the true religion, and ſuch they reciprocally appeared to be in each other's eyes. The Bohemians maintained that Huss had been unjuſtly put to death at *Conſtance*, and conſequently revenged, with the utmoſt fury, the injury that had been done him. They acknowledged it, nevertheleſs, as an inconteſtable principle, that *heretics* were worthy of capital puniſhment; but they denied obſtinately that Huss was a *heretic*. This pernicious maxim, then, was the ſource of that cruelty that diſhonoured the exploits of both the parties in this dreadful war, and it is, perhaps, difficult to determine, which of the two carried this cruelty to the greateſt height.

The Calixtines.

V. All thoſe, who undertook to avenge the death of the Bohemian martyr, ſet out upon the ſame principles, and, at the commencement of the war, they ſeemed to agree both in their religious ſentiments and in their demands upon the church and government from which they had withdrawn themſelves. But as their numbers increaſed, their union diminiſhed, and their army being prodigiouſly augmented by a confluence of ſtrangers from all quarters, a great diſſenſion aroſe among them, which, in the year 1420, came to an open rupture, and divided this multitude into two great factions, which were diſtinguiſhed by the titles of *Calixtines*, and *Thaborites*. The former, who were ſo called from their inſiſting upon the uſe of the *cup* or chalice, in the celebration of the euchariſt, were mild in their proceedings and modeſt in their demands, and ſhewed no diſpoſition to overturn the ancient ſyſtem of church-government, or to make any conſiderable changes in the religion, which was publicly received. All that they required may be comprehended under the four articles which follow. They demanded *firſt*, that the word of God ſhould be explained to the people in a plain and perſpicuous manner, without the mixture of ſuperſtitious com-

---

Wenceſlaus with conſternation, and ſo affected that puſillanimous monarch, that he was ſeized with an apoplexy, of which he died in a few days.]

ments or inventions; *ſecondly*, that the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper ſhould be adminiſtered *in both kinds*; *thirdly*, that the clergy, inſtead of employing all their attention and zeal in the acquiſition of riches and power, ſhould turn their thoughts to objects more ſuitable to their profeſſion, and be ambitious of living and acting as became the ſucceſſors of the holy apoſtles; and *fourthly*, that tranſgreſſions of a more heinous kind, or *mortal ſins*, ſhould be puniſhed in a manner ſuitable to their enormity. In this great faction, however, there were ſome ſubordinate ſects, who were divided upon ſeveral points. The adminiſtration of the Lord's ſupper was one occaſion of diſpute; JACOBELLUS DE MISA, who had firſt propoſed the celebration of that ordinance *under both kinds*, was of opinion, that infants had a right to partake of it, and this opinion was adopted by many; while others maintained the contrary doctrine, and confined the privilege in queſtion to perſons of riper years [y].

Taborites.

VI. The demands of the *Taborites*, who derived their name from a mountain well known in ſacred hiſtory, were much more ample. They not only inſiſted upon reducing the religion of JESUS to its primitive ſimplicity, but required alſo that the ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical government ſhould be reformed in the ſame manner, the authority of the pope be deſtroyed, the form of divine worſhip changed; they demanded, in a word, the erection of a new church, a new hierarchy, in which CHRIST alone ſhould reign, and all things ſhould be carried on by a divine direction and impulſe. In maintaining theſe extravagant demands, the principal doctors among the *Taborites*, ſuch as MARTIN LOQUIS, a Moravian, and his followers, went ſo far as to flatter themſelves with the chimerical notion that CHRIST would deſcend in perſon upon earth, armed with fire and ſword, to extirpate hereſy, and purify the church from its multiplied corruptions. Theſe fanatical dreams they propagated every where, and taught them even in a public manner with unparalleled confidence and preſumption. It is this enthuſiaſtic claſs of the Huſſites alone, that we are to look upon as accountable for all thoſe abominable acts of violence, rapine, deſolation, and murder, which are too indiſcriminately laid to the charge of the Huſſites in general, and to their two leaders ZISKA and PROCOPIUS in particular [z].

[y] BYZINII *Diarium Huſſiticum*, p. 130.

[z] From the following opinions and maxims of the Thaborites, which may be ſeen in the *Diarium Huſſiticum* of BYZINIUS, we may form a juſt idea of their deteſtable barbarity: *Omnes legis Chriſti adverſarii debent peniri ſeptem plagis noviſſimis, ad quarum executionem fideles ſunt provocandi.—In iſto tempore ultionis Chriſtus in ſua humilitate et miſeratione non eſt imitandus ad ipſos peccatores ſed in zelo et furore et juſta retributione.—In hoc tempore ulticnis, quilibet fidelis, etiam preſbyter*, quantumcunque ſpiritualis, eſt maledictus, QUI GLADIUM SUUM CORPORALEM PROHIBET A SANGUINE *adverſariorum legis Chriſti, ſe* DEBET MANUS SUAS LAVARE IN EORUM SANGUINE *et ſanctificare*. From men, who adopted ſuch horrid and deteſtable maxims, what could be expected, but the moſt abominable acts of injuſtice and cruelty? For an account of this dreadful and calamitous war the reader may conſult (beſides the ancient writers ſuch as SYLVIUS, THEOBALDUS, COCHLÆUS, and others) LENFAN *Hiſtoire de la guerre des Huſſites*, which was publiſhed at *Amſterdam* in two volumes in 4to. in the year 1731. To this hiſtory it will, however, be adviſeable to add the *Diarium Belli Huſſitici* of BYZINIUS, a book worthy of the higheſt eſteem on account of the candour and impartiality with which it has been compoſed, and which Mr. LENFANT does not ſeem to have conſulted. This valuable production has been publiſhed, though incomplete, in the VI volume of the *Reliquiæ*

It muſt indeed be acknowledged, that a great part of the Huſſites had imbibed the moſt barbarous ſentiments with reſpect to the obligation of executing vengeance upon their enemies, againſt whom they breathed nothing but bloodſhed and fury, without any mixture of humanity or compaſſion.

The commotions in *Bohemia* terminated.

VII. In the year 1433, the council of *Baſil* endeavoured to put an end to this dreadful war, and for that purpoſe invited the Bohemians to their aſſembly. The Bohemians, accepting this invitation, ſent ambaſſadors, and among others PROCOPIUS their leader, to repreſent them in that council. But, after many warm debates, theſe meſſengers of peace returned without having effected any thing, that might even prepare the way for a reconciliation ſo long and ſo ardently deſired. The *Calixtines* were not averſe to peace; but no methods of perſuaſion could engage the *Taborites* to yield. This matter, however, was tranſacted with more ſucceſs by ÆNEAS SYLVIUS and others, whom the council ſent into *Bohemia* to renew the conferences. For theſe new legates, by allowing the *Calixtines* the uſe of the cup in the holy ſacrament, ſatisfied them in the point which they had chiefly at heart, and thereby reconciled them with the Roman pontif. But the *Taborites* remained firm, adhered inflexibly to their firſt principles, and neither the artifice nor eloquence of SILVIUS, nor the threats, ſufferings, and perſecutions to which their cauſe expoſed them, could vanquiſh their obſtinate perſeverance in it. From this period, indeed, they began to review their religious tenets, and their eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, with a deſign to render them more perfect. This review, as it was executed with great prudence and impartiality, produced a very good effect, and gave a rational aſpect to the religion of this ſect, who withdrew themſelves from the war, abandoned the doctrines, which, upon ſerious examination, they found to be inconſiſtent with the ſpirit and genius of the goſpel, and baniſhed from their communion all thoſe whoſe diſordered brains or licentious manners might expoſe them to reproach [a]. The *Taborites*, thus new modelled, were the ſame with thoſe *Bohemian brethren* (or *Piccards*, i. e. *Beghards*, as their adverſaries called them) who joined LUTHER and his ſucceſſors at the reformation, and of whom there are at this day many of the deſcendants and followers in *Poland* and other countries.

Commentators.

VIII. Among the greateſt part of the interpreters of ſcripture that lived in this century, we find nothing worthy of applauſe, if we except their zeal and their good intentions. Such of them as aimed at ſomething higher than the character of bare compilers, and ventured to draw their explications from their own ſenſe of things, did little more than amuſe, or rather delude their readers with *myſtical*, and *allegorical* fancies. At the head of this claſs of writers is ALPHONSUS TOSTATUS, biſhop of *Avila*, whoſe voluminous

---

Manuſcriptorum of the very learned JOHN PETER LUDWIG. See alſo BEAUSOBRE's Supplement to the *Hiſtoire de la Guerre des Huſſites, Lauſanne* 1745, in 4$^{\text{tv}}$.

[a] See ADRIANI REGENVOLSCHII *Hiſtoria Eccleſ. provinciar. Slavonicar.* lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 165.—JOACH. CAMERARII *Hiſtorica Narratio de fratrum Eccleſiis in Bohemia, Moravia et Polonia, Heidelb.* 1605, in 4$^{\text{to}}$.—JO. LASITII *Hiſtoria fratrum Bohemicorum*, which I poſſeſs in manuſcript, and of which the VIII$^{\text{th}}$ Book was publiſhed in 8$^{\text{vo}}$ at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1649.

commentaries upon the ſacred writings exhibit nothing remarkable but their enormous bulk. LAURENTIUS VALLA is entitled to a more favorable judgment, and his ſmall collection of *Critical* and *Grammatical Annotations upon the New Teſtament*, is far from being deſtitute of merit, ſince it pointed out to ſucceeding authors the true method of removing the difficulties that ſometimes preſent themſelves to ſuch as ſtudy with attention the divine oracles. It is proper to obſerve here, that theſe ſacred books were, in almoſt all the kingdoms and ſtates of *Europe*, tranſlated into the language of each reſpective people, particularly in *Germany*, *Italy*, *France*, and *Britain*. This circumſtance naturally excited the expectations of a conſiderable change in the ſtate of religion, and made the thinking few hope, that the doctrine of the church would be ſoon reformed by the light, that could not but ariſe from conſulting the genuine ſources of all divine truth.

The ſcholaſtic divines and moraliſts hated and oppoſed.

IX. The ſchools of divinity made a miſerable figure in this century. They were filled with teachers, who loaded their memory, and that of their diſciples, with unintelligible diſtinctions and unmeaning ſounds, that they might thus diſpute and diſcourſe with an appearance of method, upon matters which they did not underſtand. There were now few remaining, of thoſe who proved and illuſtrated the doctrines of religion by the poſitive declarations of the holy ſcriptures and the ſentiments of the ancient fathers, and who, with all their defects, were much ſuperior to the vain and obſcure pedants of whom we now ſpeak. The ſenſeleſs jargon of the latter did not eſcape the juſt and heavy cenſure of ſome learned and judicious perſons, who looked upon their method of teaching as highly detrimental to the intereſts of true religion, and to the advancement of genuine and ſolid piety. Accordingly various plans were formed by different perſons, ſome of which had for their object the abolition of this method, others its reformation, while, in the mean time, the enemies of the *ſchool-men* increaſed from day to day. The myſtics, of whom we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more largely hereafter, were ardently bent upon baniſhing entirely this ſcholaſtic theology out of the Chriſtian church. Others, who ſeemed diſpoſed to treat matters with more moderation, did not inſiſt upon its total ſuppreſſion, but, were of opinion, that it was neceſſary to reform it, by aboliſhing all vain and uſeleſs ſubjects of debate, by reſtraining the rage of diſputing that had infected the ſeminaries of theology, and by ſeaſoning the ſubtilty of the ſchool-men with a happy temperature of myſtic ſenſibility and ſimplicity. This opinion was adopted by the famous GERSON, who laboured with the utmoſt zeal and aſſiduity in correcting and reforming the diſorders and abuſes that the ſcholaſtic divines had introduced into their ſeminaries [b], as alſo by SAVANAROLA, PETRUS DE ALLIACO, and NICHOLAS CUSANUS, whoſe treatiſe concerning *Learned Ignorance* is ſtill extant.

---

[b] RICH. SIMON, *Lettres Choiſies.* tom. ii. p. 269. & *Critique de la Bibliotheque Eccleſiaſtique* M. DU PIN, tom. i. p. 491.—THOMASII *Origines Hiſtor. Philoſ.* p. 56. and, principally, GERSONIS *Methodus Theologiam Studendi*, in LANOII *Hiſtoria Gymnaſ. Navarreni*, tom. iv. Opp. part. I. p. 330.

Principally by the reſtorers of polite literature and eloquence.

X. The litigious herd of ſchool-men found a new claſs of enemies equally keen, in the reſtorers of Eloquence and Letters, who were not all, however, of the ſame opinion with reſpect to the manner of treating theſe ſolemn quibblers. Some of them covered with ridicule and loaded with invectives the ſcholaſtic doctrine, and demanded its ſuppreſſion, as a moſt trifling and abſurd ſyſtem, that was highly detrimental to the culture and improvement of the mind, and every way proper to prevent the growth of genius and true ſcience. Others looked upon this ſyſtem as ſupportable, and only propoſed illuſtrating and poliſhing it by the powers of eloquence, thus to render it more intelligible and elegant. Of this claſs was PAULUS CORTESIUS, who wrote, with this view, a commentary on the *Book of Proverbs*, in which, as we learn from himſelf, he forms a happy union between eloquence and theology, and cloaths the principal intricacies of ſcholaſtic divinity with the graces of an agreeable and perſpicuous ſtyle [c]. But after all, the ſcholaſtic theology, ſupported by the extraordinary credit and authority of the Dominicans and Franciſcans, maintained its ground againſt its various oppoſers, nor could theſe two religious orders, who excelled in that litigious kind of learning, bear the thoughts of loſing the glory they had acquired by quibbling and diſputing in the pompous jargon of the ſchools.

And alſo by the Myſtics.

XI. This vain philoſophy, however, grew daily more contemptible in the eſteem of the judicious and the wiſe, while, at the ſame time, the *Myſtics* gathered ſtrength, and ſaw their friends and abettors multiply on all ſides. Among theſe there were, indeed, certain men of diſtinguiſhed merit, who are chargeable with few of the errors and extravagancies that were mingled with the diſcipline and doctrine of that famous ſect, ſuch as THOMAS à KEMPIS (the author of the Germanic theology, ſo highly commended by LUTHER) LAURENTIUS JUSTINIANUS, SAVANAROLA, and others. There are, on the other hand, ſome writers of this ſect, ſuch as VINCENTIUS FERRERIUS, HENRICUS HARPHIUS, and BERNHARD SENENSIS, in whoſe productions we muſt carefully ſeparate certain notions which were the effects of a warm and irregular fancy, as alſo the viſions of DIONYSIUS, whom the *Myſtics* conſider as their chief, from the noble precepts of divine wiſdom, with which they are mingled. The *Myſtics* were defended againſt their adverſaries the Dialecticians, partly by the Platonic doctors, who were every where held in high eſteem, and partly by ſome even of the moſt eminent ſcholaſtic doctors. The former conſidered DIONYSIUS, as a perſon whoſe ſentiments had been formed and nouriſhed by the ſtudy of Platoniſm, and wrote commentaries upon his writings; of which we have an eminent example in MARCILIUS FICINUS, whoſe name adds a luſtre to the Platonic ſchool. The latter attempted a certain ſort of aſſociation between the ſcholaſtic theology and that of the Myſtics; and in this claſs were JOHN GERSON, NICHOLAS CUSANUS, DIONYSIUS the Carthuſian, and others.

The ſtate of polemic or controverſial divinity.

XII. The controverſy with the enemies of Chriſtianity was carried on with much more vigour in this than in the preceding ages, and ſeveral learned and eminent men ſeemed now to exert themſelves with peculiar induſtry and zeal in demonſtrating the truth of that divine religion, and defending it againſt the various objections of its adverſaries. This appears from the learned book of MARCILIUS FICINUS, *Concerning the Truth of Chriſtianity*, SAVANAROLA's *Triumph of the Croſs*, the *Natural Theology* of RAYMOND DE SABUNDE, and other productions of a like nature. The Jews were refuted by PEREZIUS and JEROME DE St. FOI, the Saracens by JOHANNES DE TURRECREMATA, and both theſe claſſes of unbelievers were oppoſed by ALPHONSUS DE SPINA, in his work entitled, *The Fortreſs of Faith*. Nor were theſe pious labours in defence of the Goſpel at all unſeaſonable or ſuperfluous; on the contrary, the ſtate of things at this time rendered them neceſſary. For, on the one hand, the Ariſtotelian philoſophers in *Italy* ſeemed, in their public inſtructions, to ſtrike at the foundations of all religion; and on the other hand, the ſenſeleſs ſubtilties and quarrels of the ſchool-men, who modelled religion according to their extravagant fancies, tended to bring it into contempt. Add to all this, that the Jews and Saracens lived in many places promiſcuouſly with the Chriſtians, who were therefore obliged, by the proximity of the enemy, to defend themſelves with the utmoſt aſſiduity and zeal.

---

[c] This work was publiſhed in folio at *Rome* in the year 1512, and at *Baſil* in 1513.

The ſchiſm between the Latins and Greeks not yet healed.

XIII. We have already taken notice of the fruitleſs attempts that had been made to heal the unhappy diviſions that ſeparated the Greek and Latin churches. After the council of *Florence*, and the violation of the treaty of pacification by the Greeks, NICHOLAS V exhorted and intreated them again to turn their thoughts towards the reſtoration of peace and concord. But his exhortations were without effect; and in about the ſpace of three years after the writing of this laſt letter, *Conſtantinople* was beſieged and taken by the Turks. And from that fatal period to the preſent time, the Roman pontifs, in all their attempts to bring about a reconciliation, have always found the Grecian patriarchs more obſtinate and intractable than they were when their empire was in a flouriſhing ſtate. Nor is this circumſtance ſo difficult to be accounted for when all things are duly conſidered. This obſtinacy was the effect of a rooted averſion to the Latins and their pontifs, that acquired, from day to day, new degrees of ſtrength and bitterneſs in the hearts of the Greeks; an averſion, produced and nouriſhed by a perſuaſion that the calamities they ſuffered under the Turkiſh yoke might have been eaſily removed, if the weſtern princes and the Roman pontifs had not refuſed to ſuccour them againſt their haughty tyrants. And accordingly when the Greek writers deplore the calamities that fell upon their devoted country, their complaints are always mingled with heavy accuſations againſt the Latins, whoſe cruel inſenſibility to their unhappy ſituation they paint in the ſtrongeſt and moſt odious colours.

The inteſtine diviſions and conteſts of the Latins.

XIV. We paſs over in ſilence many trifling controverſies among the Latins, which have no ſort of claim to the attention of our readers. But we muſt not omit mentioning the revival of that famous diſpute concerning the *kind* of worſhip that was to be paid to the blood of CHRIST, which was firſt kindled at *Barcelona*, in the year 1351, between the Franciſcans and

Dominicans, and had been left undecided by CLEMENT VI [d]. This controverſy was now renewed at *Brixen*, in the year 1462, by JACOBUS à MARCHIA, a celebrated Franciſcan, who maintained publicly in one of his ſermons, that the *blood*, which CHRIST ſhed upon the croſs, did not belong to the *divine nature*, and of conſequence was not to be conſidered as an object of *divine* and immediate *worſhip*. The Dominicans rejected this doctrine, and adopted, with ſuch zeal, the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion, that JAMES, of *Brixen*, who performed the office of inquiſitor, called the Franciſcan, before his tribunal and accuſed him of *hereſy*. The Roman pontif PIUS II, having made ſeveral ineffectual attempts to ſuppreſs this controverſy, was at laſt perſuaded to ſubmit the matter to the examination and judgment of a ſelect number of able divines. But many obſtacles aroſe to prevent a final deciſion, among which we may reckon as the principal, the influence and authority of the contending orders, each of which had embarked with zeal in the cauſe of their reſpective champions. Hence, after much altercation and chicane, the pontif thought proper to impoſe ſilence on both the parties in this miſerable diſpute, in the year 1464; declaring, at the ſame time, "That both ſides of the queſtion might be lawfully held, until CHRIST'S "*Vicar* upon earth ſhould find leiſure and opportunity for examining the "matter, and determining on what ſide the truth lay." This *leiſure* and *opportunity* have not as yet been offered to the pontifs [e].

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies that were uſed in the church during this century.

Rites of the Greek church.

I. THE ſtate of religious ceremonies among the Greeks may be learned from the book of SIMEON of *Theſſalonica*, *Concerning Rites and Hereſies* [f], from which it appears that the ſubſtance of religion was loſt among that people, that a ſplendid ſhadow of pomp and vanity was ſubſtituted in its place by the rulers of the church; and that all the branches of divine worſhip were ordered in ſuch a manner as to ſtrike the imaginations and captivate the ſenſes of the multitude. They pretended, indeed, to alledge ſeveral reaſons for multiplying, as they did, the external rites and inſtitutions of religion; and caſting, over the whole of divine worſhip, ſuch a pompous garb of worldly ſplendor. But in theſe reaſons, and in all the explications they give of this gaudy ritual, there is much ſubtilty and invention, without the leaſt appearance of truth or good ſenſe to render them plauſible. The origin of theſe multiplied rites, that caſt a cloud over the native beauty and luſtre of religion, is often obſcure, and frequently diſhonourable. And ſuch as, by force of ill-applied genius and invention, have endeavoured to derive honour to theſe ceremonies from the circumſtances that gave occaſion to them, have failed egregiouſly in this deſperate attempt. The deceit is too palpable to ſeduce any mind that is void of prejudice and capable of attention.

---

[d] LUC. WADDINGI. *Annal. Minor.* tom. viii. p. 58.—JAC. ECHARDI *Scriptor. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 650.

[e] WADDINGI *Annal. Minor.* tom. xiii. p. 206.—NAT. ALEXANDER, *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sæc.* xv. p. 171.

[f] J. A. FABRICIUS gives us an account of the contents of this book in his *Biblioth. Græca*, vol. xiv. p. 54.

Rites increaſed in the Latin church.

II. Though the more rational and judicious of the Roman pontifs complained of the over-grown multitude of ceremonies, feſtivals, temples, and the like, and did not ſeem unwilling to have this enormous maſs ſomewhat diminiſhed, they nevertheleſs diſtinguiſhed, every one his own pontificate, by ſome new inſtitution, and thought it their duty to perpetuate their fame by ſome new edict of this nature. Thus CALIXTUS III, to immortaliſe the remembrance of the deliverance of *Belgrade*, from the victorious arms of MAHOMET II, who had been obliged to raiſe the ſiege of that city, ordered, in the year 1456, the feſtival in honour of the *Tranſfiguration of* CHRIST (which had been celebrated in ſome places by private authority before this period) to be religiouſly obſerved throughout all the weſtern world. And SIXTUS IV, in the year 1476, granted *Indulgences* by an expreſs and particular edict to all thoſe, who ſhould devoutly celebrate an annual feſtival in honour of the *immaculate conception of the bleſſed Virgin*, with reſpect to which none of the Roman pontifs before him had thought proper to make any expreſs declaration, or any poſitive appointment [g]. The other additions that were made to the Roman ritual, relating to the worſhip of the Virgin MARY, public and private prayers, the traffic of *Indulgences*, and other things of that nature, are of too little importance to deſerve an exact and circumſtantial enumeration. We need not ſuch a particular detail to convince us, that in this century religion was reduced to mere ſhew, to a ſhew compoſed of pompous abſurdities and ſplendid trifles.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the hereſies, ſects, and diviſions that troubled the church during this century.

Manicheans and Waldenſes.

I. NEITHER the ſevere edicts of the pontifs and emperors, nor the barbarity and vigilance of the unrelenting *inquiſitors* could extirpate the remains of the ancient hereſies, or prevent the riſe of new ſects. We have already ſeen the Franſciſcan Order at open war with the church of *Rome*.

---

[g] See RAPH. VOLATERRANI *Comment. Urbani*, lib. viii. f. 289.—ÆNEAS SYLVIUS, *De Statu Europæ ſub Frederico* III. cap. x. in FREHERI *Scriptor. rerum Germanicar.* tom. ii. p. 104.

In *Boſnia*, and the adjacent countries, the Manicheans, or Paulicians, who were the ſame with the ſect named, in *Italy*, *Cathariſts*, propagated their doctrines with confidence, and held their religious aſſemblies with impunity. It is true, indeed, that the great protector of the Manicheans, Stephen Thomascus, king of *Boſnia*, abjured their errors, received baptiſm by the miniſtry of John Carvaialus, a Roman cardinal, and, in conſequence thereof, expelled theſe heretics out of his dominions. But it is alſo certain, that he afterwards changed his mind; and it is well known, that, towards the concluſion of this century, the Manicheans inhabited *Boſnia*, *Servia*, and the neighbouring provinces. The *Waldenſes* alſo ſtill ſubſiſted in ſeveral European provinces, more eſpecially in *Pomerania*, *Brandenburg*, the diſtrict of *Magdeburg* and *Thuringia*, where they had a conſiderable number of friends and followers. It appears, however, by authentic records, which are not yet publiſhed, that a great part of the adherents of this unfortunate ſect, in the countries now mentioned, were diſcovered by the *inquiſitors*, and delivered over by them to the civil magiſtrates, who committed them to the flames.

Beghards, Schweſtriones, Picards, and Adamites.

II. The *Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit* (who were called, in *Germany*, *Beghards*, or *Schweſtriones*, and, in *France*, *Turelupins*, and whoſe diſtinctive character was a ſpecies of myſticiſm, that bordered upon frenzy) wandered about in a ſecret and diſguiſed manner in ſeveral parts of *France*, *Germany*, and *Flanders*, and particularly in *Suabia* and *Switzerland*, where they ſpred the contagion of their enthuſiaſm, and caught the unwary in their ſnares. The ſearch, however, that was made after them was ſo ſtrict and well-conducted, that few of the teachers and chiefs of this fanatical ſect eſcaped the hands of the *inquiſitors* [*b*]. When the war between the *Huſſites* and the votaries of *Rome* broke out in *Bohemia* in the year 1418, a troop of theſe fanatics, with a perſon at their head whoſe name was John, repaired thither, and held ſecret aſſemblies, firſt at *Prague*, and afterwards in different places, from whence they, at length, retired to a certain iſland, where they were leſs expoſed to the notice of their enemies. It was, as we have already had occaſion to obſerve, one of the leading principles of this ſect, that the tender inſtincts of nature, with that baſhfulneſs and modeſty that generally accompany them, were evident marks of *inherent corruption*, and ſhewed, that the mind was not ſufficiently *purified* nor rendered conformable to the divine nature, from whence it derived its origin. And they alone were deemed perfect by theſe fanatics, and ſuppoſed to be united to the ſupreme Being, who could behold, without any emotion, the naked bodies of the ſex to which they did not belong, and who, in imitation of what was practiſed before the fall by our firſt parents, went ſtark naked, and converſed familiarly in this manner with males and females, without feeling any of the tender propenſities of nature. Hence it was that the BEGHARDS (whom the Bohemians, by a change in the pronuntiation of that word, called *Picards*) when they came into their religious aſſemblies, and were preſent at the celebration of divine worſhip, appeared abſolutely naked, without any ſort of veil or covering at all. They had alſo conſtantly in their mouths a maxim, which, indeed, was very ſuitable to the genius of the religion they profeſſed, *viz, that* THEY WERE NOT FREE (*i. e.* ſufficiently extricated from the ſhackles of the body) *who made uſe of garments, particularly ſuch garments as covered the thighs and the parts adjacent*. Theſe horrible tenets could not but caſt a deſerved reproach upon this abſurd ſect; and though nothing paſſed in their religious aſſemblies that was contrary to the rules of virtue, yet they were univerſally ſuſpected of the moſt ſcandalous incontinence and of the moſt laſcivious practices. ZISKA, the auſtere general of the Huſſites, gave credit to theſe ſuſpicions and to the rumours they occaſioned; and, falling upon this miſerable ſect in the year 1421, he put ſome to the ſword, and condemned the reſt to the flames, which dreadful puniſhment they ſuſtained with the moſt chearful fortitude, and alſo with that contempt of death that was peculiar to their ſect, and which they poſſeſſed in a degree that ſeems to ſurpaſs credibility [i]. Among the various titles, by which theſe extravagant enthuſiaſts were diſtinguiſhed, that of *Adamites* was one; and it was given them on account of their being ſo ſtudious to imitate the ſtate of innocence in which the firſt man was originally created. The ignominious term of *Beghards*, or *Picards*, which was at firſt peculiar to the ſmall ſect of which we now treat, was afterwards applied to the *Huſſites*, and to all the Bohemians who oppoſed the tyranny of the Roman church. All theſe were called by their enemies, and indeed by the multitude in general, *Picard friars*.

[*b*] Felix Malleolus (whoſe German name is *Haemmerlein)* in his account of the *Lollards*, which is ſubjoined to his book *Contra validos Mendicantes*, i. e. *againſt the ſturdy Beggars*, *Oper. plog. c. 2. a.* has given us a liſt, though a very imperfect one, of the *Beghards* that were committed to the flames in *Switzerland* and the adjacent countries during this century. This author, in his books againſt the *Beghards* and *Lollards*, has (either through deſign, or by a miſtake founded on the ambiguity of the terms) confounded together three different claſſes of perſons, who were uſually known by the appellation of *Beghards* and *Lollards*, as 1*ſt*, the *Tertiaries* or third order of the more auſtere Franciſcans. 2*dly*, the *Brethren of the free ſpirit*; and 3*dly*, the *Cellite* or *Alexian* friars. Many writers have fallen into the ſame error.

The White Brethren.

III. A new ſect, which made a great noiſe and infected the multitude with the contagion of their enthuſiaſm, aroſe about the beginning of this century. A certain prieſt, whoſe name is not known, deſcended from the *Alps* [k], arrayed in a white garment, and accompanied with a prodigious number of perſons of both ſexes, who, after the example of their chief, were alſo cloathed in white linen, from whence they were diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Fratres Albati*, i. e. *White Brethren*. This enthuſiaſtic multitude went in a kind of proceſſion through ſeveral provinces, following a croſs, which their leader held erected like a ſtandard, and, by the ſtriking appearance of their ſanctity and devotion, captivated to ſuch a degree the minds of the people wherever they went, that perſons of all ranks and orders flocked, in crowds, to augment their number. The new chief exhorted his followers to appeaſe the anger of an incenſed Deity, emaciated his body by voluntary acts of mortification and penance, endeavoured to perſuade the European nations to renew the war againſt the Turks in *Paleſtine*, and pretended, that he was favoured with divine viſions, which inſtructed him in the will and in the ſecrets of heaven. BONIFACE IX apprehending, that this enthuſiaſt or impoſtor concealed inſidious and ambitious views [l], had him ſeized and committed to the flames, upon which his followers were diſperſed and his ſect entirely extinguiſhed. Whether a puniſhment ſo ſevere was inflicted with reaſon and juſtice, is a point that has been debated, and yet remains uncertain; for ſeveral writers of great credit and authority maintain the innocence of this ſectary, while others aſſert, that he was convicted of the moſt enormous crimes [m].

---

[i] See JO. LASITII *Hiſtoria Fratrum Bohemorum* Mſ. lib. ii. § 76. who proves in a ſatiſfactory and circumſtantial manner, that the *Huſſites* and the *Bohemian Brethren* were entirely diſtinct from theſe *Picards*, and had nothing at all in common with them. The other authors, that have written upon this ſubject, are honourably mentioned by ISAAC DE BEAUSOBRE, in his *Diſſertation ſur les Adamites de Boheme*, which is ſubjoined to LENFANT'S *Hiſtoire de la Guerre des Huſſites*. This learned author is at vaſt pains in juſtifying the *Picards*, or Bohemian *Adamites*, whom he ſuppoſes to have been the ſame with the *Waldenſes*, and a ſett of men eminent for their piety, whom their enemies loaded with the moſt groundleſs accuſations. But this is manifeſtly endeavouring to waſh the Æthiopian white. For it may be demonſtrated, by the moſt unexceptionable and authentic records, that the account I have given of the matter is true. The reſearches I have made, and the knowledge they have procured me of the civil and religious hiſtory of theſe times, entitle me perhaps to more credit in ſuch a point as this, than the laborious author from whom I differ, whoſe acquaintance with the hiſtory of the middle age was but ſuperficial, and who was, by no means, exempt from prejudice and partiality.

The men o underſtanding.

IV. In the year 1411, a ſect was diſcovered in *Flanders*, and more eſpecially at *Bruſſels*, which owed its origin to an illiterate man, whoſe name was ÆGIDIUS CANTOR, and to WILLIAM of HILDENISSEN, a Carmelite monk, and whoſe members were diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Men of underſtanding*. There were many things reprehenſible in the doctrine of this ſect, which ſeemed to be chiefly derived from the theology of the Myſtics. For they pretended to be honoured with celeſtial viſions, denied that any could arrive at a perfect knowledge of the Holy Scriptures without the extraor-

---

[(k) THEODORIC DE NIEM tells us, that it was from *Scotland* that this ſect came, and that their leader gave himſelf out for the prophet *Elias*. SIGONIUS and PLATINA inform us, that this enthuſiaſt came from *France*; that he was cloathed in white, carried in his aſpect the greateſt modeſty, and ſeduced prodigious numbers of people of both ſexes and of all ages; that his followers (called *penitents*) among whom were ſeveral cardinals and prieſts, were cloathed in white linen down to their heels, with caps which covered their whole faces, except their eyes; that they went in great troops of ten, twenty, and forty thouſand perſons from one city to another, calling out for mercy, and ſinging hymns; that wherever they came, they were received with great hoſpitality, and made innumerable proſelytes; that they faſted, or lived upon bread and water during the time of their pilgrimage, which continued generally nine or ten days. See *Annal. Mediol.* ap MURATORI.—NIEM. lib. ii. cap. xvi.]

[(l) What Dr. MOSHEIM hints but obſcurely here is farther explained by SIGONIUS and PLATINA, who tell us, that the pilgrims, mentioned in the preceding note, ſtopped at *Viterbo*, and that BONIFACE, fearing leſt the prieſt, who headed them, deſigned by their aſſiſtance to ſeize upon the pontificate, ſent a body of troops thither, who apprehended the falſe prophet, and carried him to *Rome*, where he was burnt.]

[m] See LENFANT, *Hiſt. du concile de Piſe*, tom. i. p. 102.—POGGIA, *Hiſtoria Florentina*, lib. iii. p. 122.—MARC. ANTON. SABELLICUS *in Enneadibus Rhapſodiæ Hiſtoricæ*, *Ennead.* ix. lib. ix. tom. ii. Opp. p. 839. publiſhed in folio at *Baſil* in the year 1560.

dinary

CENT. XV.

dinary ſuccours of a Divine illumination; declared the approach of a new revelation from heaven, more complete and perfect than the Goſpel of CHRIST; maintained, that the reſurrection was already accompliſhed in the perſon of JESUS, and that no other reſurrection was to be expected; affirmed, that the inward man was not defiled by the outward actions, whatever they were; that the pains of hell were to have an end, and that, not only all mankind, but even the devils themſelves, were to return to God, and be made partakers of eternal felicity. This ſect ſeems to have been a branch of that of the *Brethren and Siſters of the free ſpirit*; ſince they declared, that a new diſpenſation of grace and ſpiritual liberty was to be promulgated to mortals by the Holy Ghoſt. It muſt, however, be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their abſurdities were mingled with ſeveral opinions, which ſhewed, that they were not totally void of *underſtanding*; for they maintained among other things, "*1ſt*, that CHRIST alone had merited eternal life and felicity for the human race, and that therefore men could not acquire this ineſtimable privilege by their own actions alone; *2dly*, that the prieſts, to whom the people confeſſed their tranſgreſſions, had not the power of abſolving them, but that it was CHRIST alone in whom this authority was veſted; and *3dly*, that voluntary penance and mortification were not neceſſary to ſalvation." Theſe propoſitions, however, and ſome others were declared *heretical* by PETER D'AILLY, biſhop of *Cambray*, who obliged WILLIAM of HILDENISSEN to abjure them [*n*], and oppoſed with the greateſt vehemence and ſucceſs the progreſs of this ſect.

A new ſect of Flagellantes or Whippers.

V. The ſect of the *Flagellantes*, or *Whippers*, continued to excite commotions in *Germany*, more eſpecially in *Thuringia* and the *Lower Saxony*; but theſe fanatics were very different from the ancient heretics of the ſame name, who ran wildly in troops through various provinces. The new *Whippers* rejected not only the ſacraments, but alſo every branch of external worſhip, and placed their only hopes of ſalvation in *faith* and *flagellation*, to which they added ſome ſtrange doctrines concerning the *evil ſpirit*, and other matters, which are not explained with ſufficient perſpicuity in the records of antiquity. The perſon that appeared at the head of this ſect in *Thuringia* was CONRAD SCHMIDT, who, with many of his followers, was apprehended and committed to the flames [*o*], in the year 1414, by HENRY SCHONEFELD, who was, at that time, inquiſitor in *Germany*, and rendered his name famous by his induſtry and zeal in the extirpation of hereſy. Nicholas Schaden ſuffered at *Quedlingburg* for his attachment to this ſect. Berthold Schade, who was ſeized at *Halberſtadt* in the year 1481, eſcaped death, as appears moſt probable, by abjuring their doctrine [p]; and we find in the records of theſe unhappy times a numerous liſt of the *Flagellantes*, whom the *German* inquiſitors devoted to the flames.

[*n*] See the records of this tranſaction in STEPH. BALUZ. *Miſcellan.* tom ii. p. 277.

[*o*] *Excerpta Monachi Pirnenſis*, in JO. BURCH. MENKENII *Scriptor. rerum Germanicar.* tom. ii. p. 1521.—*Chron. Monaſter.* in ANTON. MATTHÆI *Analect. vet. ævi*, tom. v. p. 71.—*Chron. Magdeb.* in MEIBOMII *Scriptor. rerum German.* tom. ii. p. 362.—From XVI articles of faith adopted by this ſect, which were committed to writing by a certain inquiſitor of *Brandenborch* in the year 1411, and which CONRAD SCHMIDT is ſaid to have taken from the papers of *Walkenried*, we may derive a tolerable idea of their doctrine, of which the ſubſtance is as follows: *That the opinions adopted by the Roman church with reſpect to the efficacy of the ſacraments, the flames of purgatory, praying for the dead, and ſeveral other points are entirely falſe and groundleſs; and that the perſon, who believes what is contained in the Apoſtle's Creed, repeats frequently the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria, and at certain times laſhes his body ſeverely, as a voluntary puniſhment of the tranſgreſſions he has committed, ſhall obtain eternal ſalvation.*

---

[p] See the account of this matter which is given by the learned Jo. Ernest. Kappius, in his *Relat. de rebus Theologicis Antiquis et Novis*, A. 1747, p. 475.

The END *of the* First Volume.

BOOKS Printed for A. MILLAR.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

FOLIO.

1. THE *Ceremonies* and *Religious Cuſtoms* of the *various Nations* of the *Known World*: Illuſtrated with *Picart's Cuts.* In 7 vols.

2. *Biſhop Burnet's Hiſtory* of *His Own Time*, In 2 vols.

3. *Biſhop Burnet's Hiſtory* of the *Reformation* of the *Church of England*. The 3d Part. Being a Supplement to the 2 vols. formerly publiſhed.

4. The *Works* of the Learned *Iſaac Barrow*, D. D. late Maſter of Trinity-College, *Cambridge*. In 2 vols.

5. A *Paraphraſe* and *Commentary* on the *New Teſtament*. In 2 vols. By Dr. *Whitby*. The Sixth Edition.

6. The *Works* of the Moſt Rev. Dr. *John Tillotſon*, Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*. The Fifth Edition. In 3 vols. To which is now firſt added, The Life of the Author, by the Rev. Dr. *Birch*, S. R. S.

7. *Expoſitory Notes*, with *Practical Obſervations* on the *New Teſtament*. By *William Burket*, M. A. late Vicar and Lecturer of *Dedham* in *Eſſex*. The Thirteenth Edition, with Cuts.

QUARTO.

8. A New Hiſtory of *England*. In 6 vols. By *David Hume*, Eſq.

9. A *Syſtem of Moral Philoſophy*, in 3 Books. Witten by the late *Francis Hutcheſon*, L L. D. Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Univerſity of *Glaſgow*, publiſhed from the Original MSS. by his Son *Francis Hutcheſon*, M. D. To which is prefixed, Some Account of the *Life*, *Writings*, and *Character* of the Author. By the Rev. *William Leechman*, D. D. 2 vols.

10. The Hiſtory of *Philoſophy*: Containing the *Lives*, *Opinions*, *Actions*, and *Diſcourſes* of the *Philoſopher*, of every *Sect*. By *Thomas Stanley*, Eſq. The Fourth Edition. In which the *innumerable Miſtakes*, both in the *Text* and *Notes* of all former Editions are *corrected*; the *Citations* and *References* exactly adjuſted, and compared throughout with the *Originals*, and with the *Latin Tranſlation*, printed at *Leipſick*.

11. *Diſcourſes* on all the principal Branches of *Natural Religion* and *Social Virtue*. By *James Foſter*, D. D. In 2 vols.

OCTAVO.

12. THE *Hiſtory* of the *Propagation* of *Chriſtianity*, and the Overthrow of *Paganiſm*. Wherein the *Chriſtian Religion* is confirmed; the Riſe and Progreſs of Heatheniſh Idolatry is conſidered; the Overthrow of *Paganiſm*, and the ſpreading of Chriſtianity, in the ſeveral Ages of the Church, is explained; the preſent State of the Heathens is enquired into; and Methods for their Converſion propoſed. In 2 vols. The Third Edition corrected, with Additions. By *Robert Millar*, A. M.—*The Biſhop of* London, *in his Paſtoral Letters*, p. 133. *recommends this Book as written by a faithful and judicious Hand.*

13. *Preſumptive Arguments* for the Truth and Divine Authority of the Chriſtian Religion; in Ten Sermons. To which is added, A Sermon upon God's Moral Government. By *James Duchall*, D. D.

14. *Sermons* on Various Subjects. By *John Abernethey*, M. A. with a large Preface, containing the Life of the Author. In 4 vols. The 3d and 4th vols. may be had ſeparate.

15. *Sermons* on Several Subjects. By *John Orr*, M. A. Rector of *Marybourgh*, in the Dioceſe of *Leighlin*. Second Edition. In 2 vols. Either Volume may be had ſeparate.

16. *Sermons* on Various Subjects. By *John Balguy*, M. A. late Vicar of *North-Allerton*, in the County of *York*, and Prebendary of *Sarum*. In 2 vols.

17. *Sermons* on ſeveral important Subjects. By *John Foſter*, D. D. In 4 vols.

18. The *Divine Legation of Moſes*. In 9 Books. The 4th Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. The firſt vol. in 2 Parts.

19. The *Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion occaſionally opened and explained*, in a Courſe of Sermons preached before the Hon. Society of *Lincoln's-Inn*. In 2 vols.

20. The Alliance between *Church and State*: Or, The *Neceſſity and Equity of an Eſtabliſhed Religion, and a Teſt-Law demonſtrated*. In 3 Books. The Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged.

21. *Julian*: Or, A Diſcourſe concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption, which defeated that Emperor's Attempt to Rebuild the Temple of *Jeruſalem*. In which the Reality of a Divine Interpoſition is ſhewn; the Objections to it are anſwered, and the Nature of that Evidence which demands the Aſſent of every reaſonable Man to a miraculous fact, is conſidered and explained. The Second Edition with Additions.

The above 4 by *W. Warburton*, Lord Biſhop of *Glocester*.

22. A *View of* Ld. *Bolingbroke's Philoſophy* complete, in four Letters, to a Friend. In which his whole Syſtem of Infidelity and Naturaliſm is expoſed and confuted. With the Apology prefixed. The Second Edition.

23. The ſame Book in One Volume, Duodecimo. Third Edition.